

Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5596. A bill to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 6822. A bill to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6823. A bill to exempt admissions to religious, educational, and charitable entertainments and to certain concerts from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 6824. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the payment of prior construction costs of certain hospitals approved as projects under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 6825. A bill to repeal the excise tax on electric, gas, and oil ranges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6826. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 with respect to the eligibility for benefits of certain employees on furlough on the date of enactment of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 6827. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands to provide for the issuance of leases of oil and gas lands by competitive bidding in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. Res. 646. Resolution to print the prayers offered by the Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, 1945-48; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina introduced a bill (H. R. 6828) to provide for the retirement with pay of Lt. Comdr. Harold Kaminski, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2063. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Three Lakes Taxpayers Association,

Three Lakes, Wis., in opposition to the Federal aid to education bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2064. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harold E. Lachel and others, of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement and passage of postal salary legislation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2065. Also, petition of the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation of certain conditions relating to the conduct of our occupation of Germany and the policy and activities of our Government relating to German war industries; to the Committee on Rules.

2066. Also, petition of William M. Parmely, of Port Tampa City, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to suit against the Veterans' Administration for the violation of constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2067. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau and others, of St. Petersburg, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

O Lord our God, deliver us from the fear of what might happen and give us the grace to enjoy what now is and to keep striving after what ought to be. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. IVES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 7, 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 agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on investigation of national resources for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

S. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University; and

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING TODAY'S SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I announce that it is the intention that the Senate stay in session through the afternoon and on into the night to complete the work in hand.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL PICKET BOATS TO CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the city of Philadelphia, Pa., had requested the Navy Department to transfer two picket boats for use by the fire and police departments of that city, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITION

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) presented the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolutions relative to the recognition of the state of Israel and the lifting of the embargo on arms to Palestine

Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts on February 13, 1919, resolved that the national aspirations and historic claims of the Jewish people with regard to Palestine be recognized; and

Whereas the general court on March 29, 1922, urged the Government of the United States to recognize the status of the Jewish people in Palestine; and

Whereas the Government of the United States on May 14, 1948, recognized the state of Israel: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hail the recognition of the state of Israel by the Government of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts favors and urges the lifting of the embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, and to the Members of Congress representing Massachusetts.

In senate, adopted, May 27, 1948.

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, May 27, 1948.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FLANDERS, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2279. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1537).

By Mr. MOORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2192. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to agents of carriers subject to part I of such act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1538).

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

H. R. 2744. A bill to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; with amendments (Rept. No. 1543).

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2034. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541); and

S. 2401. A bill to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1542).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5822. A bill to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1550).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2820. A bill to authorize the Administration of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public park and golf course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1551); and

S. 2821. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1552).

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

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1545);

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Henry Hill; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546);

S. 2359. A bill for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1547);

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553);

H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554);

H. R. 2766. A bill to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725); without amendment (Rept. No. 1544);

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabradia Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rice Tablot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555);

H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken; without amendment (Rept. No. 1556);

H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Deiman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1548);

H. R. 4663. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners in fee simple of the land leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1549); and

H. R. 5330. A bill for the relief of W. W. DeLoach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557).

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODE— REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill, to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1539) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2829) to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill, to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and I submit a report (No. 1540) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2823. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1934, to provide for allowances to the heirs, representatives, and assigns of Frank J. Boudinot, deceased, in the event of favorable determination by the Indian Claims Commission of certain claims of the Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2824. A bill for the relief of William K. Buren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. Ives):

S. 2825. A bill to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2826. A bill to authorize the advancement on the retired list of Col. Benjamin Oliver Davis to the grade of brigadier general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2827. A bill for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2828. A bill for the relief of James Stewart Corp. and James Stewart & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 2829) to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE, also from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to correct the service records of Navy veterans of the War With Spain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE— INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT, 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. KILGORE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 22, line 20, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That such amounts shall not be expended for the construction of any aircraft carrier in excess of 40,000 tons unless the construction of such carrier has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO REPORT HOUSE BILL 6556

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to file a report on House bill 6556, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, by midnight.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Committee on the Judiciary to sit and hold hearings during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

He also asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Public Works to meet during the session today.

He also asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Steel of the Small Business Committee to sit during the session today.

THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS' SERVICE FOUNDATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of remarks prepared by him on the subject of the DAV. Service Foundation; which appears in the Appendix.]

DEATH BLOW TO PRIVATE PENSIONS?— ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article en-

titled "Death Blow to Private Pensions?" by David Lawrence, from the United States News and World Report for April 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT OF FREE ENTERPRISE?—ADDRESS BY T. COLEMAN ANDREWS

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What of Free Enterprise?" delivered by T. Coleman Andrews before the Virginia Bankers Association at Lynchburg, Va., on May 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF BOOK, A NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE OIL INDUSTRY

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Here Is Danger," published in the Economic Council Review of Books for June 1948, being a review of the book, A National Policy for the Oil Industry, by Eugene V. Rostow, professor of law and a member of the graduate faculty of economics at Yale University; which appears in the Appendix.]

1948 IS THE YEAR TO VOTE AMERICAN—ARTICLE FROM COLLIER'S MAGAZINE

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "1948 Is the Year To Vote American," published in a recent issue of Collier's magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

A SETTLEMENT WITH RUSSIA—ITS NECESSITY FOR WORLD FEDERATION—ADDRESS BY GRENVILLE CLARK

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Settlement With Russia—Its Necessity for World Federation," delivered by Grenville Clark on February 7, 1948, to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; which appears in the Appendix.]

CARRYING OF MAIL ON STAR ROUTES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 263) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3951 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 434), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Postmaster General may, in his discretion and in the interest of the postal service, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3949 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 429), by mutual agreement with the holder of any star-route contract, renew such contract at the rate prevailing at the end of the contract term, for additional terms of four years with such bond as may be required by the Postmaster General. Any such contract may be terminated at the end of any 4-year term at the option of the Postmaster General or the contractor or terminated at any time by operation of any existing law.

"The Postmaster General may, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, with the consent of the contractor, and without regard to the provisions of sections 3958 and 3961 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, secs. 438 and 441), readjust the compensation of a star-route contractor for increased or decreased costs occasioned by changed conditions occurring during the contract term which could not reasonably have been anticipated at the time of making his original proposal or executing his bond for a renewed contract as provided herein."

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. The motion was agreed to.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION BY CENSUS BUREAU

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 554) to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the Director of the Bureau of the Census, hereinafter referred to as the Director and the Bureau, respectively, is authorized and directed to take, compile, and publish the censuses of manufacturers, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and transportation (exclusive of means of transportation for which statistics are required by law to be filed with a designated regulatory body), in the year 1949 and every fifth year thereafter, and each such census shall relate to the year immediately preceding the taking thereof: *Provided*, That the census of manufacturers shall not be taken in 1949. The censuses herein provided for shall include the United States and its Territories and such possessions as may be determined by the Director with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) That the Director is further authorized to make such surveys as are deemed necessary to furnish annual and other interim current data on the subjects covered by the censuses provided for in this and other acts.

Sec. 2. That the following sections of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), shall apply to the censuses and surveys authorized by this act: Section 3, as amended by section 404 of Reorganization Plan No. II (53 Stat. 1436), and sections 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15, except that the Director may also authorize the expenditure of necessary sums for travel expenses for attendance at training courses held by the Bureau: *Provided*, That in connection with any survey conducted by the Director pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), with respect to the answering of questions and furnishing of information, shall apply only to such inquiries as are within the scope of the schedules and of the type and character heretofore used in connection with the taking of complete censuses under the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), or in connection with any censuses hereafter taken pursuant to section 1 (a) of this act and the act of June 18, 1929: *Provided further*, (a) That sections 9 and 10 of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), shall apply to surveys conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act only after publication of a determination with reasons therefor certified by the Director with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce that the information called for is needed to aid or permit the efficient performance of essential governmental functions or services; or has significant application to the needs of the public, business, or industry and is not publicly available from nongovernmental or other governmental sources; (b) that in the case of any new survey said sections 9 and 10 shall apply only after public notice, given by the Director at least 30 days in advance of requesting a return, that such survey is under consideration; (c) that the provisions of said section 9 and 10 shall not apply to any survey more frequent than annual

conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act; and (d) that the provisions for imprisonment provided by said sections 9 and 10 shall not apply in connection with any survey conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act.

Sec. 3. That inquiries, and the number, form, and subdivisions thereof for the censuses and surveys provided for in this act, shall be determined by the Director, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. To the extent that the provisions of this act conflict with the provisions of any other act, pertaining to the Bureau of the Census, the provisions of this act shall control: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to revoke or impair the authority of any other Federal agency with respect to the collection or release of information.

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. The motion was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that the pending question is the amendment which I have proposed to Senate bill 2655 authorizing the Secretary of the Army to enlist qualified aliens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts adding a new subsection on page 3, after line 22.

Mr. LODGE. I will say, Mr. President, that I have been trying to obtain a hearing for this proposal on many occasions, and I have always had the experience of no one being ready to listen to me when I made my presentation. I believe that if Senators will listen to me they will be convinced. Of course, if they are not present when I speak they cannot be convinced.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Connor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Brooks	Hoey	Reed
Buck	Holland	Revercomb
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stennis
Cooper	Lodge	Stewart
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Underwood
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSH-FIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I address myself to the amendment which I offered to Senate bill 2655, to authorize the Secretary of the Army, until June 30, 1950, to enlist qualified aliens between the ages of 18 and 35, in an aggregate number not to exceed 50,000 men. This would, of course, reduce the manpower demands contemplated by the pending bill to the extent of 50,000 men, although that is not the prime reason for which I am offering the amendment.

The amendment is similar to Senate bill 2016, which I introduced, and on which hearings were held. It would authorize the Army to conduct this experiment for a 2-year period, at the end of which time the permission would expire, unless previously renewed.

The number 50,000 is about 15 percent of the proposed total of our Regular Army and is the number which qualified experts believe can be most efficiently absorbed.

At the end of 5 years of satisfactory service these men can become American citizens. It is the plan of the Army to use them in Alaska, the Far East, and the Caribbean.

Secretary of State Marshall stated with reference to the proposed plan that he believed it "worthy of very serious consideration as one means of limiting the necessity for exercising the selective service power." That is General Marshall's opinion of it.

General Marshall added that he thought this proposal formed the basis of the action which is being carefully looked into at the present time. I have been orally advised that the Department of the Army also approves. In early February there was some misunderstanding in certain so-called levels of the State Department about this idea, and some objections were raised; but I believe those objections rested on a rather complete misunderstanding of what the bill was about; and they have since been cleared up.

There are many young men of Polish, Czech, anti-Nazi German, Russian, Byelorussian, and other European stocks who would gladly serve, and who are neither Communist nor Fascist in sympathy. Their hearts and emotional

loyalties are directed toward the kind of thing for which this country stands.

It is true that today the Secretary of the Army has technical power to enlist aliens, but I do not believe, and he does not believe, that such an important step should be taken on a technical basis. It should be taken only after receiving the deliberate approval of Congress. I have never heard an argument made against it. I have tried to imagine what some of the arguments could be. It might be said, perhaps, that the Russian Government might not like it. So far as that statement is concerned, it seems superfluous to say that our efforts to please the Russians have not been crowned with success, and that the Soviets are sure to vilify us no matter what we do. Having already compared our President with Hitler, it is hard to see what there is left for them to say. Moreover, they have not criticized the French Foreign Legion, which is not the same as my proposal, but is similar in the sense that it enlists aliens into the service. So we could not be consistently criticized for recruiting aliens. There are many reports to the effect that the Russians have done the same thing, and that there were many men in the Russian Army during the war who did not even speak the same language. I do not think that is disputed.

Senators will recall the remark of a certain very wise man who said, "The Russian Government can be neither appeased, conciliated, nor provoked." So I do not think we need to worry about that factor; if we decide that it is a proper step for us to take, let us take it.

Although it is not an exact parallel, it is interesting to note that Britain, in her zone in Germany, has eased her manpower problem by using Danish, Norwegian, and Belgian units. It should also be noted that we ourselves are at present employing non-American citizens to guard our supplies and our various logistical installations in Germany. So in that sense no drastically new principle would be established.

This is not a foreign-legion proposal. It is not a measure under which a group of foreigners would be recruited and put into a unit together, where they speak their own language. It is not a proposal which seeks to attract mercenaries. On the contrary, it is a provision which, if well administered—and I have every reason to believe that it would be—would give us young men who would be, in fact, extremely valuable citizen candidates.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would not the men who come in under this provision be subjected to the same requirements for admission to the armed forces of the United States in a particular component in which they enlisted, as would American citizens, except that these men would not have American citizenship?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. They would have to meet the same physical and mental standards; and, of course, they would be questioned and examined from the standpoint of loyalty to a degree that we probably would not go with

our own people. I am glad that the Senator from Connecticut asked that question, because it is very pertinent.

There is a great moral difference between a liberty legion of young men who, attracted by America and what it stands for, want to turn their backs on the disillusionments and sufferings of the Old World and become American citizens in an honorable and manly way, and a foreign legion of mercenaries established for an entirely different motive. The two things are not at all the same.

These young men would be spread through the Army in units with American soldiers, in exactly the same manner that aliens have been spread through the United States Army many times before in our history. Anyone who had contact with the Regular Army in the days before World War II, and who has attended one of the horse shows at Fort Myer and observed the men knows that there were a great many aliens among our soldiers at that time. No one objected. Not only did no one object, but those men furnished some of the finest noncommissioned officers we had when the bullets began to fly.

We would be using the services of these young men not only as we have done in the past, but just as the British Army has enlisted aliens in the integral units of the British Army ever since Queen Victoria's day. That is a fact which is substantiated by the record. I received a letter from General Gascoigne, of the British military mission on that very point. I believe the letter is in the Record.

This amendment would take pressure off our young American men, as I have said. It would give us young men whose special backgrounds and knowledge of foreign languages and foreign customs could be of great and unique military value to us. Their special qualifications could not be duplicated in this country.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether the aliens who would be permitted to enlist in the Army under the terms of the amendment would be temporarily residing in the United States, or whether they could enlist while residing abroad.

Mr. LODGE. They could enlist abroad.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding is that if an alien in Britain, for example, wanted to enlist in the United States Army, he could do so in Britain.

Mr. LODGE. I believe he could enlist at the office of the military attaché in London.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was my thought. The reason I asked the question is that, as the Senator knows, one of the finest armies we had in the last war was the Polish Army, which was more or less disbanded in Italy.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been advised that there was no unit in any of the allied forces that fought with greater valor and efficiency than did that army. I have likewise been advised by high ranking members of the United States Army that

it was a pity that some provision was not made to take a great many of those men into our own Army, not because of their military prowess but because of their democracy, character, and general all-around ability as citizen candidates. I am very glad, therefore, that the amendment is broad enough—as I thought it was—to permit the remnants of this force to join our own Army, because I believe that they would be a real contribution to the efficiency of our own armed forces.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Maryland for that remark. The Senator from Maryland has a very distinguished war record, and these factors are very real to him. He speaks very accurately, indeed, when he refers to the services rendered by the Polish Corps in World War II. It so happened that I had a little knowledge of what they did in storming Cassino in Italy. Cassino was an obstacle which had held up a great many troops. The Poles came along and did the business.

During the consideration of the displaced persons bill I heard some discussion on the question of admitting some of those Polish soldiers to this country. Of course, under this bill it would not only be possible but altogether probable that a substantial proportion of the 50,000 would be former Polish soldiers, because they are very obviously the type of men our Regular Army would like to obtain.

Let me say this in response to the observation the Senator from Maryland has made: When he asks about enlisting such men abroad and about whether an Englishman would be able to join the Army through the office of the military attaché at the Embassy, let me say that when I introduced the bill which corresponds to the amendment and when the Associated Press carried dispatches about it abroad, a large crowd of men applied to the Embassy because they misunderstood the announcement and thought the bill had become law. I can produce a large file of clippings showing that large numbers of men went to the United States Embassy and wished to join the United States Army, when they thought it possible to do so.

I yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall make one or two suggestions relative to the Senator's amendment which I think perhaps are worthy of consideration in connection with it. I notice that the amendment provides for a period of not less than 5 years of service outside continental United States. It occurs to me that anyone enlisting probably would spend 6 months or even a year in this country in being trained to be a soldier, particularly those who had not previously been soldiers. If the amendment provided for at least 4 years of service outside the United States, I think that would give the Army a chance to train any aliens who enlisted for the first time, and thus the Army would have an adequate opportunity to train them before sending them abroad. Such a procedure might be in the interest of efficiency.

Another suggestion I make to the Senator—who has given this matter

more thought than I have, of course; and my suggestions may not hold water on more profound thought regarding them—is that if he would reduce the number provided in the amendment from 50,000 to 25,000, I think he would improve the chances of the adoption of the amendment. There are some Members of the Senate with whom I have talked who would favor this proposal provided it was on a smaller scale, but they might, perchance, oppose the amendment if it continued to provide for such a large number as 50,000. So I think the Senator would be well advised if he would consider reducing the number provided by the amendment from 50,000 to perhaps 20,000 or 25,000, until the plan is tried out and until we see how well it works.

I make that suggestion, not in opposition to the purpose of the amendment, but in an effort to aid in having the amendment placed in the bill, in the first place, and, in the second place, to aid in its retention later on, if it is adopted by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think that is a very reasonable observation. I provided for 50,000 because that is 15 percent, and I had been advised by various persons in the Regular Army to whom I talked that the Army could absorb that number. But I am not at all wedded to it, and I think the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland is a very reasonable one. I can quite understand that there might be Senators who would prefer to proceed a little more gradually in this matter.

So, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection to making that change.

I also have given considerable thought to the Senator's other point, the one relative to making it possible for these men to serve in the United States. Finally, after a great deal of study, I decided not to include such language in the amendment because of the danger of absence without leave and because of the problems which might arise in the United States if we had these young men over here and if they did go absent without leave. I thought that, on the whole, for the first 2 years, for the first group of men of this sort, we should proceed on the basis suggested in the amendment. Later, after experience with this arrangement, we could see whether it would be wise to change the law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to modify his amendment?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I modify my amendment in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland; namely, on page 1, in line 4, to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-five."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be perfected as indicated.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. The point I am about to make may have been covered in the discussion on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, because once or twice I have had to step

out of the Chamber. But my recollection is that when the Senator first presented this proposal to the Senate he had in mind the use of this group of aliens in the occupied areas. I judge now, from what the Senator has said earlier, that the proposal is to have them used in the Caribbean and in Alaska and elsewhere outside both continental United States and Europe. Am I correct in my recollection of that matter? Let me inquire whether the Senator has changed his point of view with regard to it.

Mr. LODGE. I did give some thought to having them serve in Europe; but the Army itself has arrived at a conclusion on that point which I accept, and which I think is very well thought out. That is to say, the Army wishes to use these men in the Caribbean and in Alaska and in the Far East. If we arrange to have that done, then there will be no possibility that a recrudescence of old wartime emotions can occur. Personally, that point has never bothered me, because I think the type of men who would go into the service under these conditions would be men very susceptible to discipline, and I think they would have so much at stake and would be so eager to make a good record for themselves that they would not cause the problems in Europe that some persons have feared. But under the policy which is now contemplated, that could never occur.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Apropos of the question which has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I am wondering whether it would be more appropriate to leave a matter of this kind for the determination of the Army itself, rather than to try to decide it here. It seems to me we could not possibly be sufficiently acquainted with conditions which might arise, or which even exist at the present time, to be able satisfactorily to answer a question of that nature. Am I correct in that observation?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is perfectly true; and this amendment does not specify where they should be used. I simply stated to the Senator from Vermont and for the information of the Senate that it would be the policy of the Army to use these men in the Caribbean, in Alaska, and in the Far East; but that would be an administrative decision, and it ought to be such. We should not attempt to set that out in the statute.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish the Senator would make clear for the RECORD whether these troops would have certain rights to become citizens.

Mr. LODGE. They would become citizens at the end of 5 years of satisfactory honorable service.

I read from the report of the Attorney General on that subject:

Section 324 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C. 724) provides that a person who has served honorably in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for a period of 3 years, may be naturalized

without having resided in the United States for at least 5 years, if a petition for naturalization is filed while the petitioner is still in the service or within 6 months after honorable separation from such service.

I omit a portion of the report, and then continue to read from it, as follows:

Should the bill under consideration be enacted, an alien who enlists in the Regular Army under its provisions, either within or beyond the continental limits of the United States, would be eligible for the special naturalization privileges of section 324 of the Immigration Act of 1940 (supra) after having served 3 years, provided he is stationed within the United States at the time he petitions for naturalization. Such a law may prove to be an inducement for aliens to enlist in the Army as a means to gain admission to the United States and acquire citizenship in a relatively short time—

And so forth. I read further:

Under the provisions of the instant bill it would be possible for aliens of such nationalities to enlist in the United States Army overseas for a term of 5 years, and after 3 years of service be brought to the United States in a military capacity rather than as quota immigrants, where they could petition for naturalization under section 324 of the Nationality Act of 1940.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suppose it is contemplated by this amendment that if such a foreigner who enlisted in our Regular Army had ability and was recommended, he might be promoted to the rank of officer.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, very definitely; yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the RECORD should show that in the debate, and should show that there is no disposition to hold these men down to the status of enlisted men during their entire 5 years. Many of the Polish officers, for example, are well educated and speak English fluently; and if they were induced to enlist, so that they might become citizens of the United States eventually, it is not unlikely, in view of their education and training, that they might progress quickly to the rank of officer. So I think it should be stated in the RECORD that that is the understanding, so that there may be no doubt about the matter.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, very much so. Let me say in response to the very interesting question of the Senator from Maryland that in World War II the United States Army has had to work in a very close relationship with the armies of other countries. We have had a great deal of experience that we have never had before in Americans commanding foreign troops. General Devers, for example, commanded more Frenchmen than any non-Frenchman in history. He had the first French Army which was on the western front. He had the Army detachment of the Atlantic, all those Atlantic pockets the Germans had there. He had the Army detachment of the Alps on the Franco-Italian frontier. All those things involved American handling of troops.

It is not hard to imagine circumstances in which it would be extremely useful once again to have young officers of

proven ability and proven loyalty, but who had the linguistic equipment and a knowledge of conditions that it would be impossible to duplicate in this country. So I hope very much that the young men who join under the terms of this amendment may all be of officer material, and I think it is not at all far-fetched to believe that they might be.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has put his finger on one of the most valuable contributions this policy would bring forth. Certainly in any future war, the ability to enlist men and officers speaking several languages will be of more importance than perhaps it has ever been in the past, if we should ever have another large-scale war. It occurs to me that the men who might come in under the provisions of the amendment would be the nucleus of the force that should already have the ability to converse in many languages, which would be of incalculable benefit and assistance in any future military operations. That ought to be one of the assets of this policy, which would differentiate it from the average enlistment of a citizen of the United States as against the enlistment of someone of foreign nationality.

Mr. LODGE. There is no question about that. Speaking from intimate personal experience in the last 6 months of World War II, I felt the lack, and how desperately serious was our lack of officers who spoke foreign languages. There is no question about it, it is a factor that can be the equivalent of many divisions in terms of military effectiveness.

So, Mr. President, we do not have to stretch our imaginations very much nor peer into the future very far to realize how valuable these men would be, particularly if the proposed integration of the Atlantic community becomes an accomplished fact. I think if Senators will look into the future they will see the merit of this amendment from that standpoint.

Then, Mr. President, from the letters which I have received from all over the world ever since I have made this proposal, and from the knowledge which the Army has of the young manhood of Europe due to our Army's occupation of Germany, I am confident that we shall get wonderful citizens as a result of this process, that the screening which the Army will conduct will be far more thorough and, of course, extend over a much longer period of time than anything our normal immigration services could possibly do.

Mr. President, you would be surprised to see the floods of letters I received from all over the world, when the press carried the announcement that I had introduced this proposal. I submitted a great many of them for the RECORD, but I shall merely read one here from a young Frenchman, which I think is typical. It comes from Marseille, France. This is a translation:

Mr. SENATOR: I must first make my excuses for the liberty I take in writing you

these few lines to draw my case to your attention.

I learn through the Weekly French Samedi Soir about your bill to establish an American Foreign Legion comprised of young men recruited in Europe. This news has caused great joy. Why? I must tell you that I love America with all the strength of my 19 years and that I have tried every way to go there, but so far without luck. That, sir, is why I bother you with this note. I see in this article the only way of proving my love for that country and also of going there. I do not, Mr. Senator, want you by any possibility to think that America is to me only the country where they make good films and much jazz music; but it above all is the country of Washington and Lincoln and of others like them, the country of liberty, the rights of man, and finally the great Nation which is in the forefront of civilization.

Pardon, Mr. Senator, this revealing of my heart, but I hope that you will understand what it is to be very far away from the land which one loves but cannot reach. In any case I shall be the first to enlist in the legion of my certain future country.

Excuse again my clumsy letter.

I beg you, sir, to believe me. Your devoted and respected servant.

That is from a 19-year-old boy. Here is a letter from a Dutch boy in Scheveningen, Holland:

DEAR SIR: By the radio I have heard, that by the American troops strangers can come for occupation.

Christmas I was to New York and have seen the affiches, but my steamer started for Curacao, now I'm arrived this week to Holland and like me the military service by the American-occupation troops best.

My age are 20 years, we are bombarded at Rotterdam and the Haag, have lost my father and brother, the whole family from my father is murdered at Germany—the German soldiers have stolen all our stud insurance—now I will go out from Europe to forgotten all this misery and troubles—Can You understand this? Will you help me please?

Inclosed I sent stamp for your answer.

That is from a 20-year-old boy. Yes, I can understand it, and I guess you can understand it, Mr. President, and I guess we all can. We would get the cream of the young manhood of Europe. That is what we would get if this experiment were properly conducted, and I have every reason to believe it would be. But, transcending all these arguments is the fact that there are millions of people the world over who look to the United States as the guardian of democracy. It is only right that the young and able-bodied men among these people should have the privilege of helping us carry the torch. For many reasons, they cannot put their own armies into the field. But their young men can help, and should be enabled to do so. We may well recall the help which Lafayette, Kosciuszko, Steuben, and Pulaski rendered in the War of the Revolution and which their descendants gave in the Civil War.

Every Senator knows that when this country is in trouble, the more allies we have the better. We have gone to great lengths and much trouble and expense in order to leave no stone unturned to have as many allies as possible in this troubled world. That is evidenced by the ECA bill and other pieces of legislation designed in the hope that they will

make some friends for us abroad and perhaps enable us to have some allies in case of trouble. The young men whom I would enlist in our Army are individual allies of the United States, citizen candidates, young men from foreign countries who want to wear our uniform.

Mr. President, how can anyone say that the ally who is in the uniform of a foreign country is a better and more valuable friend than is the ally who is wearing the uniform of Uncle Sam? There are some persons who say it is a sign of weakness for a nation to enlist selected aliens. Such persons should visit the Revolutionary War monument at Yorktown and read the names of the foreign soldiers who fought to create the United States. I know the President pro tempore has been there and has read the names. They should go to the battlefield of Gettysburg and read the names of the Irish dead who lie buried under the Celtic cross, the German dead who fought in large numbers to preserve this country, and the working people from the mill cities of Lancashire in England. In fact, there were lovers of liberty from all over the world who fought to preserve our Nation.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the Senator say that a soldier selected from the cream of a European country would wear the uniform of the United States more proudly than a Communist who was drafted into the Army of the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a very truthful observation and is unanswerable. Mr. President, if we go to the shrines at Yorktown and Gettysburg, or to any place where blood has been shed to preserve this Nation, we shall find there were aliens there who wore the uniform of this country. Would anyone say that their service to the United States weakened this country? Is there a Senator who will say they disgraced the uniform of the United States?

Mr. President, in the interests of our own young men, in the broader interest of the Army as a whole, and for the sake of our country which wants good citizens for the future, I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that many more young men in Europe would volunteer than we could possibly accommodate?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that the very fact that such a large number of men would volunteer in order to help us to preserve freedom in Europe—because that would be one of the purposes of the Army—would itself be clear notice to Soviet Russia that our fight for freedom is gaining headway in the world?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true. That is a very interesting observation. I think the Senator is correct. It would show the popular support which exists

over there for the kind of thing that the Senator is talking about.

That concludes my remarks, Mr. President.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I am interested in the Senator's amendment. I should like to ask the Senator if he has submitted his amendment to the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. LODGE. I have. I will tell the Senator exactly what has happened. The Secretary of the Army has approved it. It then went to the State Department, and at a certain level in the State Department it was disapproved, the reason resting largely on a misunderstanding. Then it reached Secretary Marshall, and he made the statement which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks. He said:

It is worthy of very serious consideration as one means of limiting the necessity for exercising selective service power.

There the matter stands. The Army was for the amendment as an Army proposition. Then the State Department, I think largely due to a misunderstanding, interposed an objection, and the Army withdrew its support for that reason, not because the Army did not believe in the amendment as a military matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I notice in lines 1 and 2 of the amendment the words, "The Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe." Could the Senator tell us anything about what such regulations might involve? For instance, would the enlistees wear the identical uniforms worn by the United States Army?

Mr. LODGE. The plan is to put them into existing units among American soldiers.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There would be no distinguishing feature as to the uniform at all?

Mr. LODGE. No. It would not be like the French Foreign Legion, the members of which have a distinct uniform.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Would they receive the same pay as American soldiers?

Mr. LODGE. They would.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Would citizens of Russia or of her satellite nations be eligible?

Mr. LODGE. The purpose of giving the Secretary of the Army the right to prescribe regulations is to enable him to make every arrangement he thinks is necessary for security, so that only men whose worth is absolutely proven will be admitted. It seems to me that the best way is to give the Secretary of the Army the power to make such regulations, because he may have to change them from time to time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I agree with the Senator from Oregon, who stated that there will probably be more men willing to enlist than it will be possible to take into the Army. The rate of pay in the United States Army is so much greater than that of foreign armies it would naturally be a great incentive to join.

Mr. LODGE. I should amend my earlier reply to the Senator by saying that the Secretary would not have to pay the full amount of the pay of American soldiers. It might very well be that he would enlist them at a very much lower rate and increase the pay as the men showed their worth.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. At the end of 5 years they might be on full pay. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I think that can be done at the beginning, because we do not need to take in a lot of gold-brickers. There are so many young men that would join the Army because they believe in what this Nation stands for that we do not need to try to attract the kind of young men who might be attracted simply by the amount of money involved.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Has the Senator thought about what kind of an oath these enlistees would take when they join the Army?

Mr. LODGE. I have not gone into it. I understand they would take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. They would have to take a pledge of loyalty to this country. I think we can find many who would do that with a very sincere mind.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that I am 100 percent for his amendment. I cannot see why there should be any objection whatever to it. All along I have been for a limited selective service bill. I believe the bill as now written goes a bit too far. I do not think the Army has taken full advantage of training through ROTC, the National Guard, Reserve units, and so forth. There are many units throughout the United States that are sadly neglected at the present time.

There are other provisions in the bill of which I am not in favor. I do not see why in peacetime we have to register doctors up to 45 years of age and omit others. Unless the bill is amended considerably, I shall be forced, reluctantly, to vote against it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have concluded my statement on the amendment. I should like a vote on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, as modified.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I desire to state the committee's position on the amendment. Some Senators have indicated by their questions addressed to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that they might be in favor of an idea of this kind. I want to call particular attention to the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts, that we would undoubtedly have applicants from among the cream of the young manhood of Europe. In my opinion, that is a very important statement. Certainly I agree that in the United States the cream of the young manhood of the Nation comes to the colors in a time of emergency.

I know that is true. We all admit it. Certainly the advantages of becoming a citizen of the United States will hold forth a great attraction to the cream of the crop in European countries. Possibly the cream of the crop have some very patriotic views as regards their own country. Therefore, I am not quite ready to agree that the cream of the young manhood of each nation in Europe will actually apply for enlistment in our Army to become citizens of the United States. Probably the cream of the crop in those countries are wanted at home. Probably the cream of the crop in Britain—I heard that nation mentioned—would like to stay home and keep that country moving forward. Possibly they will want to enlist in their own army. I would think that the cream of the crop in each country would want to put forward the ambitions of that country in order to build it up.

If this amendment should be agreed to we would still have some applications from some very excellent material, and by that I mean young manhood in foreign countries. Possibly we would have applications for enlistment in our Army with the thought in mind that the wives and dependents of the enlistees might thereby, too, become citizens of the United States. It is not covered fully in the amendment, as it now appears before the Senate, as to whether or not the dependents of the prospective enlistees might also have offered to them citizenship rights.

In any event, I have not yet touched on the main objection considered by the committee to the amendment, which was presented to the committee by the Senator from Massachusetts, and was considered at the time the bill was voted out of the committee, and was not approved by the committee.

There is no doubt that such a proposition would provide a source of additional manpower, thought not much; the number is not particularly large. However, the committee felt that this proposal should not be coupled with the selective-service plan. The reason for that was that we knew that there was before the Senate the matter of displaced persons, and the changes to be recommended in our immigration laws.

Heretofore, in World War I and World War II, enlistments of aliens have been available in our Army. Such alien enlistees have been taken into the Army just as though they were citizens. They have not been put in units by themselves. They have had a chance to intermingle down to the squad level. In that way they have been taught American principles. It is not set forth in the amendment whether or not these 25,000 or 50,000, or whatever number may be agreed on, would be intermingled at the squad level, only one or two or five or six in a company, or whether they would be put in units all by themselves.

I believe that under the amendment the enlistees could come to the United States, but they could not serve in the United States. It provides for service outside continental United States. I would feel personally more favorable to

the amendment if it were set forth specifically that the alien enlistees should come to the United States for training, and possibly then serve outside the United States. I say that because these enlistees are to become citizens of the United States at some time. We want to have them get a chance to have the principles of America inculcated during the training period.

In reality this would mean a fundamental change in our national policy. We have heretofore said to aliens, "If you are in the United States under our immigration laws you can apply for enlistment not only in the Army, but in any branch of the armed services." The amendment limits the enlistments to the Army, not providing for enlistments in the Air Force or the Navy. Therefore it is a fundamental change.

There are many people who feel that the United States should rely upon its own citizens in matters of security, and this is the most important point. There are many who feel that a move on our part such as that contemplated would subject the Nation to the criticism that our own people are not willing to bear arms in defense of the Nation and will not take care of our present obligations completely.

On that point I might mention the fact that the other countries, from which the applicants might come, sorely need them at home. The objection might be made by some nation that we were offering the young men of European countries a chance to leave their countries, when they are sorely needed at home right now, in the rehabilitation period. It is possible treaty complications might arise.

These are but a few of the controversial issues which arise from the proposition of enlisting aliens who are not residing in the United States. In view of the fact that none of these issues has been resolved, I feel that it would be unwise at this time to attempt to resolve them by attaching this proposal to the selective service bill. On the contrary, it can best be dealt with separately, and I think to some extent it has been dealt with separately in the fact that a few days ago we passed a displaced-persons bill allowing immigration to this country. I think there would be an appropriate time when the issue could be taken up and discussed so that it would not be submerged in the broader issues of selective service.

The committee considered the proposal, and I am speaking for the committee, although I realize that some of the members of the committee were not present when the actual vote on the amendment was taken.

For the reasons I have stated, I hope the amendment will not be attached to the pending bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I feel that the bill now pending is a measure to which we should attach this amendment. When we are about to draft the young manhood of this country, I think it is appropriate to give a very convincing showing that every alternate method for obtaining manpower has been used, and that we are not taking the young men

of America except when we really have to. That is why I have urged that measures be taken so that the number of civilians in the Army be as large as possible, and that all work which could be performed by civilians in the service should be handled by civilians, so that the number of military personnel would be that number be reduced. That is why I have urged that this proposed action be taken at this time. I think the pending bill is a pertinent and appropriate measure to which to attach the provision.

I do not criticize the Senator from South Dakota at all, because it is not his fault, it is the fault of the situation in which we find ourselves in the Senate, but when I had my hearing, of 13 members of the committee only 4 were present, and I do not think I would do any better if I had a hearing at any other time. I do not believe I would be any better off if I were to take the amendment up separately as a bill. The Senator from South Dakota has been a Member of the Senate for a long time, and he knows very well that there is not any chance at all of getting what I am proposing done at this session unless it is done now. So let us not talk about taking it up as a separate measure. If we wait to have it taken up as a separate measure, it will never be taken up.

I have stated many times that of course what is proposed is not to be done in any way so as to offend any foreign nation. It is not going to be done unless a treaty or agreement is reached with a foreign nation authorizing it. So let us not talk about that, because that is not in question at all. It cannot be in question. When the Senator from South Dakota mentions that, he is mentioning something which could not occur.

I have stated many times—and the Army has indicated it clearly, and I am sorry the Senator from South Dakota was not aware of it—that the men to be brought in under my amendment would be mingled at the squad level, would be put into American units with American young men. That is not set forth in the amendment. It should not be set forth in the amendment. We should not put things like that in statutes. I do not believe the Senator from South Dakota would favor our saying how many men there should be in an infantry rifle company, or how many stripes a first sergeant should wear. I do not think it is the business of Congress to do things of that kind. But it is the plan of the Army to take these young men and put them in the existing units, sprinkle them through. If anyone knows of a better way to Americanize aliens than to put them with groups of young American men for 24 hours a day, then I do not know what it is.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I fully agree with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. However, it occurs to me that if the plan he is proposing is to be carried out as he is proposing it, the provision now in his amendment in lines 7 and 8, namely, "for service outside of the continental United

States, its Territories, and possessions," might well be omitted. Otherwise I am afraid the Senator would find that there would be a lack of flexibility, so that the amount of training would not be available, the desired work, and the desired approach which perhaps would be needed in this connection could not be exercised in any way, shape, or manner. So if it would meet with the approval of the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to move to modify his amendment by eliminating the words which I have just read in lines 7 and 8. I should like to inquire also if that would meet with the approval of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. First I should like to know exactly what the amendment is. I understand that there is some change proposed to be made in the language appearing in line 7.

Mr. IVES. Rather than deleting the words I have indicated, in order to leave the discretion entirely with the armed services, and in order to make it more clear, I would add words. I would leave the ones that are now in the amendment as they are, and in line 7, after the word "years", I would insert "for training in the United States and."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. As I see it, then, one of these enlistees could be sent to the United States for training, and would be placed with a unit, and the unit might be ordered to duty outside the United States or might not be. If it was ordered to duty inside the United States, the applicant would have to be selected out of that unit and sent to another unit which would see service outside the continental United States. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. LODGE. The modification proposed by the Senator from New York would make it possible for the Army to take these young men to the United States for training if they wanted to be trained here. They would not have to be trained here. I understood the proposal of the Senator from New York was made in an attempt to meet the suggestion made by the Senator from South Dakota in his earlier statement.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; but it would make it absolutely necessary that after the enlistees are trained they be assigned only to units that are outside the continental United States. Therefore, there would have to be two classes of combat units, one for the enlistees from overseas who could not serve in this country, and another kind of unit that could be assigned for duty anywhere, including inside the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that with only 25,000 that would not present a very formidable problem of classification. The modification proposed by the Senator from New York does not make it mandatory at all on the Army. The

Army can bring the enlistees to the United States if the Army wants to do so, and then can put them in units which the Army knows are going overseas. That would not be an insuperable administrative task at all.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out that the amendment as now presented is intended to be sufficiently elastic to be interpreted appropriately by those in command of the armed forces.

Mr. LODGE. I accept the proposed modification of the Senator from New York, and will modify my amendment so that in line 8, after the word "years" there will be inserted the words "for training in the United States and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The change is in line 7.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, in line 7.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. After the word "years."

Mr. LODGE. After the word "years", insert the words "for training in the United States and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It may be out of order, but the Chair would like to make it quite certain that the interpretation given is clear in the Record. It seems to the Chair the language is mandatory and requires training in the United States.

Mr. LODGE. That should not be. The enlistee should not have to be trained in the United States if he does not want to.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. We are having it pointedly presented to the Senate that a proposition of this kind has patently not been thoroughly thought out.

I may say further that this amendment certainly would complicate the problems of the Army in placing troops where they can best be used, for as the language is now modified, the amendment specifically says that the individuals have to be trained in the United States, and then after they are trained they cannot be placed where they can best be used, but must be used outside the continental United States; whereas we very well might want to use them in the Panama Canal Zone, in Alaska, or elsewhere. It certainly would complicate the picture for the Army, and in my opinion the mechanics of the amendment have not been thoroughly worked out.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have the amendment in proper form. In order to carry out the thought, I ask that my amendment be modified by striking out the language proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and in line 8, after the word "possessions", and insert a colon and the words "Provided, however, That enlistees may serve within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, for a training period not to exceed an aggregate of 6 months."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts has modified his amendment as he has just stated the modification.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that that is in accord with what the Army authorities want to have done. The amendment is well thought out. It is simply because it has not been given the consideration it should that we are obliged to do this kind of thing on the floor. But the basic principle of the amendment has been very well thought out, and it would not impose an insuperable administrative task on the Army at all.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to address an inquiry if I may, to the Senator from South Dakota. Unfortunately it has not been possible for me to be present during all the debate on the subject now under consideration, but I think I understood the Senator from South Dakota to say some minutes ago that one of the basic reasons he had for opposing the amendment was that he felt that in terms of patriotism Americans generally would provide the necessary manpower for any crisis. I wonder if the Senator would restate his position in that respect.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I presented several points during the course of my discussion of the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, but the basic reason why the Members of the Senate in attendance at the committee meetings when the amendment was considered opposed it was that there are those who feel that such a move on our part would subject the United States to the criticism that our own people are not willing to bear arms in the defense of the Nation, to do the complete job.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if that is a legitimate position when actually we are now considering the need, if I understand correctly, for a draft, and only for one reason, which is that on a volunteer basis we are not finding it possible in the United States to provide for the personnel needs of our Military Establishment. Does that happen to be a fact? Is that why we are actually grappling with this proposed draft?

Mr. GURNEY. That is actually the condition. The Senator has a point there. There is no question about it. Volunteers are not coming in in sufficient numbers to supply our manpower needs. Nevertheless, ours is the only country which today does not have a selective service system in operation. In time of emergency we have always had a selective service system, and every other nation has a selective service system. Whenever there are good times in a country, when there are opportunities for civilians to find desirable employment, it is difficult to find a sufficient number of volunteers. Certainly if a shooting war began we would secure more volunteers than we are securing now. We are betwixt and between. Therefore the boys do not know which way to go. I certainly do not believe that the country wants to acknowledge that we cannot get 25,000, the number mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. It happens to be my opinion that in the event of a fighting war and violent trouble we would get all the volunteers we needed. The Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Washington happen to be in complete agreement on that score.

The junior Senator from Washington intends to support the legislation presently before the Senate; but I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is deserving of all the positive study and consideration we can possibly give to it. On the basis of my own experience in other countries, I have a very high regard for the young men of other nations between the ages of 18 and 35, which I believe is the limit in the amendment. They are precisely the same types, so far as character and ability are concerned, as the immigrants who helped so materially to make this great country what it has become in the twentieth century. I believe that if we could lessen, in an intelligent way, the military-preparedness burden on the American people by utilizing the fine young men of Europe, many of whom found their sympathies and activities on our side during the war, for the betterment of this country and the maintenance of our far-flung commitments throughout the world, we would be fortunate indeed. I would not construe it as an insult to a single American citizen domiciled in this country if we were so wise as to use the best of the rest of the world and hold out to them the strength of this democracy, of which they could become citizens if they earned that right over a 5-year period.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I invite the attention of the Senator from Washington to another problem, which is a big problem before Congress, and that is the problem of successfully operating the several plans which we have approved for the rehabilitation of the countries of Europe. We are spending great sums of money to send food to Europe, and to build up the economy of European nations. For what purpose? To get those countries back on an operating basis. Can those countries get back on an operating basis if at the same time—to use the words of the Senator from Massachusetts—we offer to the cream of their citizenship, the young men between 18 and 35, the opportunity for American citizenship, and say to them, "You do not need to stay over there and make your country work. Join our Army and come to the United States." That is the point. It seems that we are hauling one way and pulling the other.

Mr. CAIN. It seems very clear to me that this country, for the most natural reasons known to man, is trying a great many experiments throughout the world, many of which are not based, by any stretch of the imagination, on the obvious merit of the experiment which is included in the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. When the

Senator from South Dakota says that draining off 50,000 men among the cream of Europe to serve our purposes would defeat the reconstruction purposes of all of Europe, I do not think it is a valid position.

Mr. GURNEY. The amendment has been modified to provide for 25,000 instead of 50,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota has now placed himself in the position where his strongest argument against the amendment is that to take 25,000 young men out of Europe would scuttle the Marshall plan, he is hard up for arguments. I do not believe that that would be true.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. We ought first to agree that the number is only 25,000, and not 50,000, as I have heard in the cloak-room.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment was modified to 25,000, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the quota provisions of our immigration laws we are allowing people to come into this country each year. All they have to do is go to the consul in some foreign country and get on the quota list. In return for the privilege of coming here and ultimately becoming citizens of this country, they assume absolutely no responsibility whatsoever. If we do not want anyone to come into this country, and say so, that is certainly a logical proposition. But here are men who agree, for five long years, to assume the responsibilities of citizenship by serving in one of the most difficult positions in which a patriotic citizen of this country is called upon to serve, namely, in the Army. They agree to be subject to the call of the Government, to be ordered anywhere on the face of the earth. Those men agree to do that for five long years, and then they are offered the privilege of becoming citizens.

My point is this: An immigrant to this country comes here and becomes a citizen under our laws without any responsibility whatsoever for service to the Government. These men, in order to show that they love the country, in order to show that they are patriotic, in order to show that they want to become citizens of the United States, agree to serve for five long years in the armed services. In other words, they qualify by the highest test of their worthiness to become citizens of the Republic. The other immigrants whom we admit discharge no responsibilities whatsoever. They do not qualify in any other way, except that they are not imbeciles and they are not Communists. That is about all we require of the immigrants who normally come to this country under the quota system. Under the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts these men discharge, for five long years, the highest obligation of citizenship, which is to contribute something, to put something into the Government of the United States.

This is a new proposal. It is only natural that it should meet with some

opposition and run into rough water. Only the other day an amendment was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] which was somewhat similar to the amendment which we are now discussing. The Senator from Illinois proposed to allow men who had served with the American forces a special preference under the displaced persons program. I certainly hope that the same logic will apply to this instance. If we are to allow people to come to the United States from all the countries of the world under a quota system, when they do nothing whatsoever to promote the sum total of the welfare of this country as a prerequisite to becoming citizens, it seems to me that we can let a mere 25,000 go into the armed services when they agree in advance, as a condition of citizenship, that they will serve 5 long years in the armed services. An honorable discharge is required before they can become citizens.

Now that number has been cut in half, I hope that the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee will at least take the amendment to conference. If he is unable to support it in conference, we shall understand that. But I believe that it ought to go to conference so that members of the House Committee, as well as Members of the Senate, may discuss the problem with Army officers and see whether or not there is real merit in the proposal.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I take issue with the Senator from Maryland when he says that these men would serve for 5 long years. They would be 5 short years.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why so?

Mr. GURNEY. I think we feed our soldiers quite well and clothe them quite well. We take care of them very well, compared with the conditions which prevail in other countries. I think that is the attraction. I am only citing the position of the committee, and a few views of my own. If the Senate wishes to settle the question, it is perfectly agreeable with me.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The period of service would be 5 long years. It is no easy thing to leave one's home, his place of nativity, his loved ones, his friends, and his family, and go far beyond the sea to a strange country where a strange language is spoken. I believe that the period of service would be 5 very long years. The statement that it would be 5 short years is a mere assertion. It is not the statement of a fact. Those men would pay a high price for citizenship; and, having paid that price, they would be worthy of our consideration.

I renew my plea that the Chairman of the committee take the amendment to conference in the hope that the House will agree.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to propound one or two inquiries regarding this

amendment. A few moments ago the able Senator discussed what the Army wanted in respect to modification of the amendment. My question is whether the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Army favor this amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator entered the Chamber, I said the Army has favored it. The Army wrote a letter favoring it. Then the matter went to the State Department, because of the diplomatic aspects. In the State Department it got one of the wrong levels where these matters are not understood, and eventually an unfavorable report came from the State Department. Thereupon, the Army withdrew its letter. Then Secretary Marshall said, when the matter finally reached him, that he thought the proposal was worthy of serious study.

So, to answer the question specifically, several months ago the Army approved the amendment. The Army did not withdraw its approval because of military reasons, but it withdrew its approval because of State Department objection. Later, the Army approved it again. We have three or four letters on it.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that the proposal is that if any such soldiers are taken into the service of the United States, the arrangement will have to be satisfactory to the countries in which the soldiers retain their citizenship.

Mr. LODGE. It could be done only as a result of a treaty or agreement with those foreign countries.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to say, before concluding, that it seems to me this amendment is highly meritorious. Like the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I sincerely hope the amendment may be taken to conference, where serious study can be given with a view to attempting to incorporate in the bill something along the line of the amendment the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Illinois for what he has said, and I am also much obliged to the Senator from Maryland for the dramatic way in which he has expressed the difference between a young man joining our Army for 5 years and a normal immigrant.

Mr. President, this project requires some imagination. If one takes a routine, dry-as-dust view of this proposal, it may appear a little frightening. But how else are we to obtain soldiers who speak various languages, soldiers who will be so utterly vital to us?

Mr. President, I predict that if this proposal becomes law, both the Navy and the Air Force, if trouble ever begins again, will be looking for some of these young foreign officers because of their linguistic accomplishments; and in case of conflict, both the Navy and the Air Force will need them as much as the Army will.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In the event that any of these soldiers, after having served 5 years in our armed forces, desired to re-

turn to their native land—perhaps conditions might be such at the end of 5 years that they would not wish to stay in the United States, but would wish to return to the country of their birth—I undertake to say that after 5 years of experience with an American Army, no finer education could be obtained by them for the purpose of spreading the democratic way of life in the country from which they originally come. It seems to me that would be a wonderful way to help thousands of men learn the democratic way of life—men who perhaps would wish to return to their own soil, rather than to establish themselves in the United States.

Mr. LODGE. That is a novel point, and I think it is worthy of consideration.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington would like to make a further observation in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. Among other things, in these troubled days we are looking for the very best Army we can get. We are not looking for anything short of the best. During the war, and in company with many other American soldiers, I saw quite a good deal of what were known as the American-Japanese soldiers, commonly called Nisei. I know of no single instance in which there was a detrimental mark against the record of any Nisei unit as it served during the whole of the last war in the American Army, and I think those men achieved that completely meritorious record because of their appreciation of the opportunities this country gave them and their respect for the obligations this country imposes upon them.

Therefore, because their appreciation would be comparable, it is my most considered opinion that if we were so fortunate as to carefully select 25,000 of the young men of the nations referred to by implication in the amendment, we would have at our disposal and disposition a corps of men who would turn out to be among the finest defenders of our faith that America has ever known.

Admittedly this is an experiment; but in these days, when, as the Senator has so well stated, we need the application of imagination, I think it is more likely that we would make—aye—a thousand mistakes in other directions before we would make a mistake by giving these young men an opportunity to work for and through this country.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we live in a day when, at this time, we engage, not in a war of bullets, not in a war of gas, not in bacteriological warfare, but in a war of ideals and ideas. In support of the suggestion, made both by inference and also in positive form by the Senator from Illinois, I judge that if we took 25,000 of the progressive, imaginative, uncynical young men of Europe and trained them in our ways, either as soldiers wearing our uniform or as citizens of this country, eventually to be returned to the land of their birth, that group of 25,000 would do more to sell America and our

ideals to others than could be done by all the billions of dollars the Congress has voted in the last 18 months. During the time I have been in the Senate, I can think of few things so vitally important and deserving of support as the proposition advanced by the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I have not been in the Chamber during all the discussion of the Senator's amendment. I wish to ask what would be done, under the amendment, in the case of the wife and children of such aliens who would be taken into the Army, and thereafter would become citizens of the United States? As the law now stands, a naturalized citizen has a right to bring his entire family into the United States.

Mr. LODGE. The present naturalization law would apply in such cases, just as in all similar cases today. No special arrangement would be made for them.

Mr. HAWKES. In other words, the families of such persons would enter the United States under the quotas for the respective countries from which the aliens have come; is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. The families would enter the United States just as happens today in the case of families of naturalized citizens. The amendment makes no change at all in that respect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been in the Appropriations Committee during the morning, and I have missed considerable of the debate in the Senate Chamber. I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I believe his amendment has a great deal of merit, and I am inclined to vote for it. I came in at a point when the Senator was saying, in answer to a question, that it would be necessary to obtain the approval, by agreement or otherwise, of the governments in Europe before such persons could enter our forces.

I should like to ask this question: What about the situation of some Balts whose country has been taken over by Russia by a unilateral decision by Russia? Those Balts have no government existing in their own country, although there may be a government in exile, somewhere. The same situation may apply to the Poles, who feel that they cannot go back to Poland, and yet they fought very well for the allied cause during the war.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to my friend from California that I made a rather complete statement on that point. I think a very large proportion of the men would come from the displaced persons. Of course no approval from any foreign government would be necessary for such men. If it were desired to get enlistees from England or France or

Italy, or other countries with a constituted government, in that case arrangement would have to be made with that country. But I believe as a practical matter the Polish and Baltic people and other displaced persons would supply a very large number of men.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was at the same meeting on appropriations the Senator from California has been attending. I should like to ask what nationals would be entitled to membership in the proposed unit? For example, would there be a German quota?

Mr. LODGE. There is no immigration quota required at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Are people of German extraction eligible?

Mr. LODGE. As I said in my opening statement, anti-Nazi Germans of course would be eligible, and I think the Army would get quite a number of them.

Mr. WHERRY. Would people beyond the Curzon line, who are of German ethnic origin, also be eligible, if they were anti-Nazi?

Mr. LODGE. That would be entirely within the discretion of the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator just answered the Senator from Nebraska that anti-Nazi Germany would be eligible. The Senator's amendment does not read that way.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. GURNEY. It refers to aliens of all nationalities.

Mr. LODGE. To aliens, that is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. It would include not only anti-Nazis but all Germans.

Mr. LODGE. It would include anybody.

Mr. GURNEY. I have no particular objection to that.

Mr. LODGE. The Army could enlist anybody it wanted to.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I want to make is, I want them to be made eligible.

Mr. LODGE. They are eligible.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to ask the distinguished Senator, What was his reason for retaining in his amendment, over the objection, as I understood from the remarks a few moments ago, by the distinguished Senator from New York, the words "for service outside of the continental United States, its Territories and possessions"?

Mr. LODGE. Let me reply to the Senator from Florida by saying that while he was out of the Chamber I modified the language so as to add, after the word "possessions", a comma and the following: "Provided, however, That enlistees may serve within the United States, its Territories and possessions, for a training period not to exceed in an aggregate of 6 months." That means that they could be brought over here for a training period and would then serve in Alaska, the Caribbean and the Far East, because that is the plan, that is the desire of the Army as to where they want to

use them. I also felt it might cause some anxiety if they could come here and then be stationed at Army posts all over the country. I think they could become Americanized very much quicker if they were overseas with American boys.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was in the Chamber when the amendment the Senator has just mentioned was placed in his amendment, but I still find in his amendment the words which to me are objectionable, "for service outside of the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and which under the rewording of the amendment still make it very clear that this provision is designed to secure some alien soldiers who, after a brief period of training here, will then necessarily be used in service outside the United States."

I may say to the able Senator I question the wisdom of that provision very greatly because I think it is fundamental to the American viewpoint toward military service and military affairs to distrust the idea of the use of mercenaries or hired troops. I think that this attitude is so fundamental to the viewpoint of our American people and so firmly established in all the pages of our history that it would discredit very largely the effort, the very fine effort, which the Senator is making.

I call to the attention of the Senator, and I suspect that his recollection of his own boyhood days in the study of history has already brought the memory back, that there is perhaps no one page in our history of the Revolutionary War which has caused more concern and more continuous feeling on the part of Americans toward the tactics that were employed by Great Britain at that time than the employment of mercenaries.

I recall that the feeling on that point was so strong that in the Declaration of Independence, among various recitals which were cataloged by the able pen of Thomas Jefferson as reasons to show that in fact "the history of the present King of Great Britain," as he referred to the then King, "is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations," was the recital, "He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death," and so forth.

I think the conviction is deeply rooted in the United States to disapprove the idea of the use of mercenaries. I call the attention of the able Senator to the fact that he is here giving a weapon to those who are interested in impugning by propaganda every motive of ours, no matter how good. He is giving them a weapon which will surely be used, if he keeps in his amendment these words which mark the aliens for preferred and exclusive service, not in America, but on foreign shores.

I call further to the attention of the distinguished Senator the fact that in my judgment he is making a departure from something that has been found to be very sound policy in the history of our Army. The first unit to which the junior Senator from Florida was assigned as an officer in World War I was a little coast artillery battery serving at Key

West. Two of the very finest soldiers in that outfit were Irish sergeants, both of whom had served with the Lancers in the British Army during the Boer War. They had come to America, they had enlisted in our Army, and had gone up step by step. One of them still lives at Key West. He is one of our honored citizens there now, retired from the Army, of course, and long ago having become an American citizen.

For years, under this provision, we attracted many men who could qualify otherwise to come into our Army, and then gave them under our laws preferred standing in their applications of citizenship, after they had served, I believe, 3 years with our armed forces.

I call attention of the Senator to the fact that in my judgment he is not only giving a weapon to those who will strike at the worthiness of the very fine motives which are animating him, but he is also departing unnecessarily from what I think has been found to be very excellent policy in connection with inviting enlistment by fine aliens into our armed forces.

So I am hoping the distinguished Senator will see fit to strike the words, "for service outside of the continental United States, its Territories and possessions," because otherwise it seems to me he puts himself in the position not only of changing the fine and well-established principle of inviting enlistments from good men among the aliens, but he also puts himself in the position of marking the enlistees as fit only to be with us for a brief period of training and then as required to go to foreign soil for service, where very certainly they will be charged with being mercenaries, and, though we are now the outspoken advocate of democracy in all the world and so regarded, we shall be charged, 't seems to me with some justice, with having done exactly the thing to which we objected so seriously on the part of Great Britain when she sent the Hessian mercenaries over here during the Revolution.

I am hoping that the Senator will, for those reasons, if they appeal to him, delete those words, which would leave the matter purely and simply on the basis of authorizing the enlistment of 25,000 men from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age or more than 35 years of age, for an enlistment period of not less than 5 years. I believe that would accomplish the Senator's purpose. I believe it would guard the proposal against very powerful objections which will be addressed against it on this side of the water by American citizens who do not like mercenaries, and also protect it against criticism by people on the other side of the water who are anxious to criticize everything we do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will state why the language is in the amendment, so that the other Members of the Senate may see whether it is in for a good reason. Let me say, first, that we will have our motives questioned, no matter what we do. If we do not do anything, we will have our motives questioned. I do not believe we have to worry very much about that. We must try to make up our minds as to what is right,

do it, and then let events decide whether we were right.

I put this language in the amendment because I know where the Army would want to use these men. It is a very hard thing to take young Americans out of America in time of peace and send them to Korea. It has a very depressing effect. It is not that they cannot "stand the gaff" physically; it is not a reflection on their courage; but we have such a wonderful country that our people do not like to leave it. In the old world, where there are famine, disease, the ravages of war, and other bad conditions, a young man goes overseas with a great deal of enthusiasm. If a young German or a young Pole were accepted and sent to Korea in the United States Army, their morale would be high. It would not be at all the serious thing for them that it would be for an American soldier.

So the amendment accomplishes two things. It relieves us of the need of imposing service on our own young men which they find extremely disagreeable; it enables young aliens to render service which is not disagreeable to them at all, and it sets up the whole thing on a basis of mutuality, which is the only successful basis. They get citizenship, which is something we give them, and they render us a useful and unique service which we cannot do as well for ourselves. These men are no more to be compared with the Hessians than black is to be compared with white. There will be only 25,000 of them. That is less than 7 percent. They will be sprinkled through the Army. If anyone can say that that makes Hessians out of them, he is capable of saying anything. They will not be drafted, anyway.

Those are my reasons for the language. Maybe my statement does not convince the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the answer of the Senator. I want to call his attention, in closing this feature of the debate, to the fact that everything he has said with reference to the desirability of using these enlistees in foreign service is capable of being wholly fulfilled if he accepts the amendment which I have suggested, because if it be true that the Army wants to use such alien enlistees primarily for service on foreign soil, it certainly may so use them, because the Senator will remember the old saying, "He's in the Army now," which will apply to each soldier covered by this amendment and he will be used wherever the Army wishes to use him.

I respectfully call the Senator's attention to the fact that the retention of these words subjects his amendment to criticism on this side of the water, and to what is more serious, misunderstanding and misrepresentation on the other side of the water. If the very thing he wishes to do can be done with complete ease and assurance, without including the questionable words, what, then, is the wisdom of insisting upon their inclusion?

I again express the hope that the distinguished Senator will see fit to amend section 2 so as to end it after the words "5 years", and strike out the reference to

compulsory service outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is an experiment. It is one that appeals to a person's imagination. I think we would arouse a good deal of apprehension if the language were not in the amendment. I have told the Senator why it is in, but I have not convinced him. But there it is.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, as the one who first proposed eliminating the words to which the Senator from Florida points at the present time, I would say that it seems to me that the Senator from Massachusetts has given very good reasons why, in the present instance, it is just as well to leave the amendment as it is. That is why, after proposing the deletion of the words in question, I yielded to him, and he left in the phraseology which now stands in the amendment as a part of the modification. Therefore, it seems to me, under those circumstances it would be well to let the amendment rest as it is, modified as it is, and try to adopt it if we can.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to add to the debate except to make one statement, namely, whether the amendment suggested by the Senator from Florida is adopted, or whether the original language remains, the amendment will be wide open in conference, and if it be desirable to change it there, after consulting with the Army authorities, either version can then be agreed upon by the conferees. So we are not passing final legislation at this stage of the game, and we should act with that in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], as modified, adding a new subsection on page 3, line 22, of the bill.

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

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hawkes	O'Connor	
Hayden	O'Daniel	

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, during the call of the roll I had opportunity to confer with some Members of the Senate regarding the provisions of the first section of the amendment. I now realize that it perhaps is better to leave the matter in the discretion of the Army. Therefore, I have modified the amendment by putting a period after the word "years", on line 7, and striking out the remainder of the sentence, so that as modified the amendment will read:

The Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized until June 30, 1950, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army not to exceed 25,000 in number from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age nor more than 35 years of age for an enlistment period of not less than 5 years.

The remainder of the amendment is as printed. I ask for a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts has been modified as he has suggested. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays. This is a very important amendment. I shall have to ask for another quorum call if the Senator from Massachusetts is not willing to have a yeas and nays vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think a yeas and nays vote is necessary, but if the Senator from Virginia desires to have one, it is satisfactory to me.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May the amendment again be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 22, it is proposed that a new subsection be added, as follows:

SEC. 2. (b) (1) The Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized until June 30, 1950, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army not to exceed 25,000 in number from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age nor more than 35 years of age for an enlistment period of not less than 5 years.

(2) Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlist in the Regular Army under the provisions of section 2 (b) (1) of this act nor to their dependents and beneficiaries.

(3) So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat. ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads "and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army" is hereby suspended until June 30, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHITE. My colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He has authorized me to say that if he were present he would vote "yea" on this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea."

The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—43

Alken	Hayden	O'Connor
Baldwin	Holland	O'Mahoney
Ball	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Tydings
Capehart	Lucas	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarthy	Watkins
Eaton	Martin	Wherry
Feazel	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Flanders	Morse	Young
Fulbright	Murray	
George	Myers	

NAYS—33

Byrd	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Connally	Kern	Russell
Cooper	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	McClellan	Stennis
Eastland	McGrath	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Maybank	Umstead
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Williams
Hickenlooper	Pepper	Wilson

NOT VOTING—20

Barkley	Dworshak	Magnuson
Brewster	Hatch	Reed
Bricker	Jenner	Saltonstall
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Bushfield	McCarran	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Wagner
Downey	McMahon	

So Mr. LODGE's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

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, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida;

S. 424. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the district of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins, and others;

S. 692. An act to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business;

S. 873. An act for the relief of Warren H. McKenney;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1249. An act authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes;

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, organized reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes;

S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036);

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen;

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946;

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army;

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174);

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels;

S. 1861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service;

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.;

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.;

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes;

S. 2288. An act to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction;

S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft;

S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances;

S. 2479. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States;

S. 2496. An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described;

S. 2553. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.;

S. 2592. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings;

S. 2593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Fungo, Va.; and

S. 2643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3628. An act to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; and

H. R. 5065. An act to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of

the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HORAN, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. BATES of Kentucky, and Mr. FOGARTY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 8, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1025. An act to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska; and

S. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the first of my four amendments for consideration at this time, the amendment being the amendment lettered "F." This amendment deals with the procedure for handling conscientious objectors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On pages 26 and 27, it is proposed to strike out, beginning with the word "religious" on page 26, line 12, to and including the word "direction" on page 27, line 1, and insert the following:

A National Commission on Conscientious Objectors to be composed of three or more civilians to be appointed by the President shall prescribe the conditions under which persons claiming exemption under this subsection shall (a) be inducted into the armed

forces, (b) be assigned to noncombatant services, (c) be assigned to special service of national importance with governmental or approved private agencies operating in the public good at home or abroad, or (d) be deferred.

On pages 27 and 28, it is proposed to strike out beginning with the word "upon", on page 27, line 5, up to and including the word "forces", on page 28, line 17, and insert the following:

If such claim is not sustained by the appropriate appeal board, the person claiming exemption shall be entitled to an appeal to the National Commission on Conscientious Objectors. The said Commission after notice and hearing shall, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, determine the validity and sincerity of such claim and whether the person claiming exemption shall (a) be inducted into the armed forces, (b) be assigned to noncombatant service, (c) be assigned to special service of national importance with governmental or approved private agencies operating in the public good at home or abroad, or (d) be deferred. The National Commission on Conscientious Objectors shall have authority to establish such subordinate boards as may be necessary and prescribe, with the approval of the President, such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this section, including pay and dependency allowances.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on this amendment. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that yesterday I discussed this particular amendment. My discussion will be found on pages 7277 and 7279 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

By way of recapitulation and reiteration of what I said yesterday, I wish again to make it perfectly clear that I hold no brief for conscientious objectors. As I stated yesterday, I find it difficult to understand their point of view and their conviction that in time of war they should not bear arms in defense of their country. However, under the Constitution of the United States conscientious objectors holding their convictions on grounds of religious faith are entitled to protection from service in the armed forces, insofar as combat service is concerned.

We have in this country groups of devoted religionists who see in war service a conflict with their religious convictions. I have the highest respect for such deep religious convictions, although I do not share their particular religious belief in this respect. I point out to the Senate, for example, that in my opinion, no finer citizenry exists in this country than the Friends, or Quakers, as they are so frequently called, many of whom hold convictions of conscientious objection insofar as military service is concerned.

They have made a valuable contribution in the history of our country. In fact, the Constitution of the United States would not be what it is today, the greatest document of freedom in the world, were it not for the contributions of the Quakers in the constitutional convention. Therefore I believe that in the passage of this bill we should be very careful to see to it that we are exceedingly fair to the Friends and to other religionists who hold conscientious objections so far as military service is con-

cerned. We should see to it that the procedures which we adopt for the handling of conscientious objectors also square with the constitutional guarantee which is theirs.

As I indicated yesterday, I recognize the fact that there are those who seek to take advantage of the constitutional protection of religious freedom by alleging a conscientious objection to service in the military when, in fact, such objection does not spring from religious conviction and faith. But I think it is possible procedurally to separate those who are truly conscientious objectors from those who are malingering and who claim to have religious convictions which they in fact do not possess. I recognize that we must watch out for those who may seek to escape a draft or military service under any guise they can adopt in order to free themselves from serving their country in the armed forces.

I feel that we should profit from the experiences we had in the last war in the handling of conscientious objectors. The record is perfectly clear that the true conscientious objector, the person who holds his convictions against military service out of deep religious faith, is a person of great courage. Conscientious objectors of this type have so demonstrated over and over again, not only during the last war, but also in the preceding World War. The true conscientious objector is no physical coward. In the last war, for example, we had—operating on a civilian assignment—a group of conscientious objectors who functioned as paratroopers in connection with fighting forest fires in the United States. Some of them served in the great Pacific Northwest. Although their parachute jumps were made under circumstances somewhat different from those attaching to parachute jumps made under combat conditions, nevertheless, I think each Member of the Senate will agree that anyone who parachutes from an airplane under any circumstances is anything but a physical coward. We also have had conscientious objectors serving in other capacities in which great physical danger to their bodies existed. Of course, I am speaking of the true conscientious objector who as a matter of religious faith cannot reconcile military service with his religious convictions.

In the last war we had much experience with conscientious objectors; and yesterday I placed in the RECORD a report of the Department of Justice on conscientious objectors, submitted by the then Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Francis Biddle. It will be found that his report is printed on page 7278 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the beginning of the third column of that page it will be seen that the Attorney General informs us that a total of 11,295 conscientious-objector cases were referred to the Department of Justice from October 16, 1940, through June 30, 1944, and that on the latter date 561 cases were pending.

The report further says:

In the treatment of the conscientious-objector problem we have profited, I believe,

from our experience in the last war. Nevertheless we have not met this problem—or, more accurately, this series of problems—with entire satisfaction, and it may be appropriate to take stock of the situation at this time.

The present law made two important departures from the provisions of the 1917 act. That act had defined conscientious objectors narrowly to include only those who belonged to an established religious sect teaching opposition to war, and it required such objectors to be inducted into the armed services for noncombatant duty. The difficulties thereby raised were so great that by Executive Order in 1918 provision was made for detached service for those inductees found by a special board to be sincere conscientious objectors to all forms of war. In the present law, the requirement of membership in a pacifist religious group was eliminated, and separate classifications were established for those who were objectors to combatant service and those who were objectors to non-combatant service as well.

In this report the Attorney General discusses the experience they had in the handling of conscientious objectors. He closes the report with a paragraph which I think is highly significant to the Members of the Senate in connection with a consideration of the amendment now pending. This is what the then Attorney General said in his report on conscientious objectors, based upon the experience they had with the procedure worked out during the war; and I suggest that these words be marked carefully, because I think they should be given great weight in determining our final vote on the amendment I have offered:

It is evident that many complexities have been encountered on both the legislative and administrative levels, and that while greater flexibility has been achieved than in the last war there is again presented an opportunity to profit from experience. In any further consideration of the selective-service legislation, or any further adoption of peacetime military training, it will be necessary to weigh the administrative, psychological, and ethical problems of conscientious objection which have not yet been fully solved.

Mr. President, I emphasize this sentence:

The Congress may well consider the desirability of meeting these complexities by establishing a board to deal especially with conscientious objectors, having final discretion with respect to their proper individual classifications as well as their prompt assignment to suitable and useful work.

It was because I was convinced that the Attorney General, on the basis of the experience set forth in his excellent report, which I included in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was entirely correct when he suggested that a separate board be set up to handle the conscientious objector problem, that I proceeded to make a study of this matter.

I do not offer this amendment on behalf of any organization. I offer it on behalf of myself, on the basis of my own study of this problem. It is true that many organizations endorse my amendment; but I wish to make very clear that in standing here today advocating this amendment, I do not do so as the mouthpiece of any organization which may be seeking to have the amendment adopted, but I am advocating the amendment because I think that from the standpoint

of both the principle and procedure proposed in the amendment it is an exceedingly sound one.

I wish to make some statements in support of the amendment; but first, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear for future reference, it will be noted that I have provided for a national commission on conscientious objectors, to be composed of three or more civilians. In that connection I emphasize the word "civilians."

In the second part of the amendment I provide for an appropriate appeal procedure, thus giving to conscientious objectors what is so dearly cherished in the United States, namely, the right to have an appeal in case they feel that the so-called lower commission has not dealt correctly with their case. I have provided for an appeal procedure which gives them the right to have a final determination made, in keeping with the wise judicial process in this country of having the rights of the individual subject, in case of litigation, to review on appeal.

The first point, a point which goes to the question of an important principle that I want to emphasize as strongly as I can. We are dealing here with a problem arising out of the Constitution of the United States itself. The problem has no connection whatever with military jurisdiction. It is not a problem that invites the Military Establishment to exercise any control or jurisdiction over it whatever. It should be separated from the general draft procedure. The problem, if it is proper to characterize any problem as a civilian problem, is clearly civilian in its nature. It goes to the question of civilian rights under the Constitution of the United States.

I restate it this way: I am raising my voice in a plea here today for something which is pretty dear in the American system, namely, that the rights of the individual, the civil rights of the individual, the civilian rights of the individual, shall be determined by civilian personnel and by procedure administered by civilian personnel. The determination of the facts and the evidence inherent in the question as to whether or not Mr. X, to use a hypothetical person, is or is not a conscientious objector in the sense that the Constitution of the United States gives him religious freedom, should be determined not by men in the military or draft boards administering a military draft act, but by representatives of a civilian board separate and distinct from a board administering a military act. After all, ours is a civilian Government. I do not think it wise, I do not think it augurs well for the future, to vest in military personnel jurisdiction and power and right to pass judgment on whether or not the facts dealing with my hypothetical man, Mr. X, properly exempt him under the Constitution of the United States from military service.

The second point I desire to stress is a very human one. I said yesterday in my few remarks on this amendment that we are dealing with a group of our people and our citizenry whom many of us cannot quite understand. They perplex us so far as their convictions are

concerned. We never have shared their religious experience, we have never shared the spiritual drive which has conditioned them to form the conviction which causes them to say as a matter of religious scruple, "Loving my country as I do, I love my God more, and I believe that, as a matter of religious faith, I would not be true to my God if I fought my fellow men in war." We do not understand that type of religious conviction Mr. President. Those of us who do not share the point of view of the true, sincere conscientious objector feel—and I think I state it rather accurately when I put it in this way—that, after all, as to temporal matters, as to those things which affect our civilian duties, we have a patriotic obligation to serve our country in time of war, even by means of taking human life in order to protect the national security of our land, and we leave to our God questions of our conscience.

But the fact that we cannot understand and do not understand and fully appreciate the religious faith and the spiritual beliefs of the conscientious objectors I think should make us overcautious and cause us to lean over backwards to make certain we deal with exceeding fairness with the conscientious objector. We should make very sure that we give to him all the protections to which he is entitled under the Constitution.

One of those protections to my mind, is to have his case passed upon by a separate civilian board. It is a psychological problem, too. The feelings of conscientious objectors involves a great many psychological considerations. I have talked to many of them as I have worked on this amendment, and they have told me without a single exception that they do not feel that persons of their point of view can possibly be convinced that they will get the type of fair hearing to which they are entitled under the laws of the land if their cases are to be passed upon by military personnel or by draft boards obligated to administer for the military this act. I do not share their distrust of the military. I do not share their views that men in uniform will not render judicial judgment on the basis of the evidence and the facts presented to them. But the fact that I feel that way in no way changes the psychology of the conscientious objectors. They look upon themselves as civilians; and they are, of course. They feel that they are standing for a civilian right. They feel that, under the Constitution, they are entitled to a procedure which brings their cases before a separate independent civilian commission for consideration and final determination.

It is difficult to read the report of the Department of Justice on the handling of conscientious objection problems during the war without realizing that, after that very valuable experience, the Attorney General himself came to the conclusion that the question of making provision for a civilian board should be given very careful consideration by the Senate when determining the Federal procedure designed to cover conscientious objectors. I cannot read the sentence which appears in the Attorney General's report

on page 7279 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with any other meaning, when he said:

Congress may well consider the desirability of meeting these complexities by establishing a board to deal especially with conscientious objectors, having final discretion with respect to their proper individual classifications as well as their proper assignment to suitable and useful work.

One other point, Mr. President, and I shall be through with respect to this amendment.

The Senate would find, if it talked to men in our Military Establishment, that they have no serious objection to this particular amendment. They have not sent to us any letters or messages endorsing the amendment—and I shall be very interested in hearing what the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my good friend from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], has to say on the attitude of the armed services regarding my amendment—but, if I am correctly advised, the heads of the armed services have no strong objections to it. In fact, I think it is proper to say that most of them would tell Senators, off the record, that they would welcome being relieved of this very troublesome problem. It was a troublesome problem for them throughout the war. As I said yesterday, many hours of local draft board time was consumed in connection with conscientious objection problems. Some officers in the Pentagon Building found it constantly one of the troublesome issues on the domestic front which confronted them throughout the war. I think, Mr. President, particularly in a peacetime draft—although I would propose the same amendment for a wartime draft—conscientious objectors should be relieved from the jurisdiction of the military and the draft boards functioning under this act. Note, Mr. President, the statement I am about to read. It was very interesting to me when I read the Attorney General's report to find the amount of labor that went into the consideration of the cases of conscientious objectors by the personnel required to handle the question. He says, for example, in his report:

On July 1, 1943, 2,094 such cases were pending in the department, and 2,111 new cases were received during the year. A total of 3,644 cases were disposed of either by formal recommendation or by return for such reasons as lack of jurisdiction, withdrawal of claim, or administrative irregularity.

He also says in the report that they had working on the problem 131 hearing officers, devoted to the task of hearing cases of conscientious objectors and passing final judgment upon them. We need a simplification of the procedure that was used during the war. My amendment will provide it in accordance with the report of the Department of Justice.

Before taking my seat, Mr. President, I want to say that I was greatly aided in the preparation of this amendment by a study of the British system of handling conscientious objectors. Of course, the concepts of religious freedom are as dear to the British as they are to Americans. It will be found that under the

British system they recognize the importance of the civilian approach to a problem which, after all, certainly is not a military one. The procedure followed in England and Canada in handling conscientious objectors is similar to the procedure set out in my amendment.

I shall ask for approval of my amendment after I hear the Senator from South Dakota. I shall ask for a record vote on this particular amendment, and I trust that my colleagues will give me the courtesy of such a vote.

In summary, I think there is involved a very important constitutional principle which ought to be handled on a civilian, rather than on a military, basis. In the second place, I think from the psychological standpoint of the conscientious objector himself he is entitled to a civilian judgment upon his case and not a judgment by the military man or draft boards which handle all types of draft cases. Thirdly, I think the form and the procedure of my amendment will do the job in a very commendable and efficient fashion. Therefore I offer the amendment to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Connor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Cooper	Lucas	Sparkman
Cordon	McCarthy	Stewart
Donnell	McClellan	Taft
Dworshak	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McKellar	Thye
Eaton	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Malone	Umstead
Feazel	Martin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon provides for a change in the method of handling conscientious objectors under the Selective Service Act in force during World War II. It proposes that a separate board or commission be set up to take care of the conscientious-objector problem. It also provides, in the last line of the amendment, that the Commission, with the approval of the President, may authorize "pay and dependency allowances."

Our committee believes that the way the conscientious objectors were taken

care of during the war worked out very well, generally, with the full approval of the country. The bill which is now pending follows the 1940 act, with very few technical amendments, worked out by those in Selective Service who had charge of the conscientious-objector problem during the war.

The committee also recommended that in case a conscientious objector doing civilian work was disabled, or died during the work because of an accident, he should receive compensation similar to that provided for any other civil-service employee, or his estate should be compensated accordingly. The committee recommends that that provision for death and disability be incorporated in the bill, and it is in the bill as presently before the Senate. As I said, it parallels very closely the 1940 act.

Basically, the proposed amendment proposes fundamental changes in the treatment of conscientious objectors. In the first place, it would create a national commission. The commission would to a marked extent intervene in the functions performed by the local boards. The Senate must understand that during the war the local boards had almost full control over the question as to who was a conscientious objector and who was not. If a local board disapproved of a claim for exemption, the finding went to the State board, and there was the right of appeal to the national board. As Senators will remember, conscientious objectors who wanted to serve in noncombatant troops, such as medical-aid men or corpsmen, were put in uniform but not given combat duties. I may say that they performed yeoman service. Those whose conscientious objections did not go to the point where they did not want to put on uniforms were given noncombatant work and came under military control, but were always kept out of combat. Those whose religious beliefs prevented them from engaging in combat work, or prevented them entirely from putting on a uniform, were put into conscientious objectors' camps and, as will be remembered, performed service in civilian hospitals, worked at farm labor, in parks, and so forth. But the local board first made the findings.

The Commission which is proposed to be created by the amendment would also exercise a sort of dual responsibility with the armed forces with respect to this class of registrants. Actually, as the bill is now written, conscientious objectors are treated very liberally and very fairly. The contention that they are under the thumb of the military is not borne out, even by the most casual reading of the bill. The bill clearly states that conscientious objectors who refuse any type of service in uniform are to be assigned to work under civilian not military control.

The problem of dealing with conscientious objectors is a most difficult one, and I can see no merit to a plan which, as its only recommendation, simply creates another commission superimposed on top of our already complicated administrative structure, to prescribe

conditions of treatment for conscientious objectors.

The second amendment in this proposal, which would strike out the major portions of pages 27 and 28, does not seem to do anything really constructive for the conscientious objectors. Heretofore, the Department of Justice has investigated appeals which the objectors make from the local boards. The amendment places the duty upon the newly created commission. What we are after really are the facts, and the Department of Justice has always shown itself perfectly capable of uncovering the facts. A new commission for that purpose is not necessary.

The local selective service board, which classifies these men, would have no way in which to ascertain whether or not they were simply attempting to evade service, rather than having a bona fide conscientious objection. Therefore, striking that part of the section having to do with investigation by the Department of Justice would preclude the thorough investigation needed in these cases.

The plan suggested in the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would require the establishment of a separate government agency appointed by the President, to operate a program for conscientious objectors. If the amendment were adopted the time between the passage of this measure and the adjournment of Congress would preclude the obtaining of a budget for such a project. Therefore it would not be possible until Congress reconvenes in 1949, next year, to carry out the provisions of the amendment. The Office of Selective Service Records has already prepared the budget for the operation of a program as outlined in the presently prepared legislation, and it is now being considered by the Bureau of the Budget.

It is contemplated that the operation of a program under the selective-service system for conscientious objectors in work of national importance shall be under the control of civilians. It was under the control of civilians during the war. The National Selective Service Board handled it, with civilian advisers. The proposed operation under the bill will be about as follows: The Director will appoint, from representatives of churches to which men who claim conscientious objection are members, an advisory board to aid him in establishing the character and type of work of national importance which will be done by men exempted on the ground that they are conscientious objectors.

If the amendment prevails, and no agency is provided to receive conscientious objectors from local boards when so classified, it will mean that they will simply be deferred without any responsibility for any type or character of service, and this particular classification will then be very attractive to those who have already indicated that they intend to evade service through civil disobedience.

The bill as now written provides no authority for pay for conscientious objectors who are opposed to any type of military service. This parallels in identi-

cal detail the act which was in effect during the war.

Actually, providing pay for these individuals imposes a hardship on them—strange as that may seem. If they are paid by the Federal Government they can properly work only for the Federal Government; they cannot work for private individuals or institutions, because in such an event the Federal Government is in the obvious position of subsidizing the individuals or institutions for whom the conscientious objector works. The net effect, therefore, is that the conscientious objector cannot be assigned to work in a civilian hospital, on a State reclamation program, or on privately owned farms. Should he be assigned to such work the Federal Government is subsidizing the program; and should the hospital or the State or the individual farmer pay him a salary, the conscientious objector is in the position of earning much more than men who are in the armed forces. The only employment left would be in large work camps operated by the Federal Government, and this deprives the conscientious objector of the best fields for his endeavor. The procedure followed during World War II, when the local agency or individual paid the salary, has therefore been adhered to.

In view of these reasons, and possibly others, the committee recommends that the amendment be not accepted.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

MR. MORSE. I shall reply to the Senator from South Dakota very briefly, because I think my amendment clearly speaks for itself. When the Senator from South Dakota says that the procedure provided by the pending bill follows very closely and is very similar to the procedure which was followed in the handling of conscientious objectors during the last war, in my judgment he proves my case. He is proposing for a peacetime draft the continuation of a procedure for the handling of conscientious objectors which is almost identical with the procedure which was followed during the war. Thereby he confesses that he is not willing to take advantage of the lessons we learned during the last war in the handling of conscientious objectors. He confesses that he is not willing to put into effect the findings of the Department of Justice itself, from which I quoted at length in my main remarks last night and today, insofar as handling conscientious objectors is concerned.

My plan, Mr. President, effectuates the views of the Attorney General of the United States, whose Department functioned as the hearing department and the appeal department during the war. On the basis of that experience the Attorney General said in his report:

The Congress may well consider the desirability of meeting these complexities by establishing a board to deal especially with conscientious objectors, having final discretion with respect to their proper individual classifications as well as their prompt assignment to suitable and useful work.

I simply say to the Senator from South Dakota that we now have an opportunity to put into effect what the Department

of Justice, on the basis of its experience with this problem, advises us in the Attorney General's report is the type of procedure we should adopt.

The second point I wish to make in answering the argument of the able Senator from South Dakota is that I consider him quite wrong when he takes the position that the procedure of the bill as it comes before the Senate is free from military control and domination. I do not believe the Senator from South Dakota has given sufficient attention to the psychological effect of having the question of the civilian rights of conscientious objectors, insofar as their constitutional privileges are concerned, determined by draft boards and officials which pass judgment upon the application of a military draft law. So long as we keep them under the military draft law, we shall create the psychological effect in the minds of the conscientious objectors that they are being treated as though they were in the Army, when in fact their religious faith and convictions make it impossible for them to accept Army procedure and Army dictates. After all, our selective service system, at the top level, is administered by the military, and the conscientious objectors know that fact. All I can point out to the Senator from South Dakota is that the churches and the religious groups that seek the type of procedure for which I am asking in my amendment are solidly behind the procedure which I advise, and solidly opposed to the procedure which the Senator from South Dakota recommends. They feel and fear the bill in its present form provides in fact for military domination.

The third point I wish to make in my answer to the Senator from South Dakota is with respect to his comment upon the financial provisions of my amendment. I think he is distinctly in error when he seeks to give the Senate the impression that under my amendment there would not be funds for the administration of my proposed method for handling conscientious objectors. The funds will come from the funds which are set aside for the administration of the draft law. The amendment would be a part of the draft law, and it would not require a separate appropriation. It would be part and parcel of the draft law; and the appropriation which covers the draft law would cover the administration of this procedure for the handling of conscientious objectors. Therefore I respectfully submit that there is no merit in the argument made by the Senator from South Dakota as to the claim that my amendment does not provide for funds with which to administer it.

Lastly, without reiterating what I placed in the Record last night, I wish to put the issue this way: The question is whether or not in our country, which is still governed by a civilian Government, we are to have the constitutional rights of conscientious objectors determined as suggested by the Attorney General in his report, by a separate civilian board, or whether we are to classify the conscientious objectors within and under a military procedure for the determination of their rights.

I close by reiterating what I stated earlier. I do not understand the psychology of conscientious objectors. I do not share their point of view in regard to military service. But I recognize their constitutional rights to exemption on the grounds of religious faith if they in fact have such a deep religious and spiritual faith. I say that in keeping with the civilian ideals of this country, their rights should be determined by such civilian procedure as I recommend in my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—22

Aiken	Ives	Sparkman
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Millikin	Watkins
Cain	Moore	Wherry
Capehart	Morse	Wiley
Dwornak	Murray	
Flanders	Robertson, Va.	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Hawkes	Maybank
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	O'Connor
Brooks	Hoey	O'Daniel
Cooper	Holland	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Donnell	Kem	Revercomb
Eastland	Knowland	Russell
Eaton	Lucas	Saltonstall
Ellender	McCarthy	Smith
Feazel	McClellan	Stewart
Ferguson	McGrath	Thye
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
George	McMahon	Umstead
Green	Malone	Vandenberg
Gurney	Martin	Williams

NOT VOTING—26

Barkley	Hayden	Stennis
Bricker	Jenner	Taylor
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	White
Connally	Magnuson	Wilson
Downey	Reed	Young
Hatch	Robertson, Wyo.	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up the second of my four amendments, the one identified by the letter "H."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 6, after the word "medical", insert "(including the osteopathic)."

On page 8, line 4, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

On page 8, line 8, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

On page 8, line 17, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last evening I discussed the amendment very briefly, as appears at page 7277 and following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall not discuss it at any considerable length at this time, other than to point out that I now hold in my hand a letter which I have received from the representatives of the osteopaths. I wish to call attention to one paragraph of the letter, as follows:

Congress provided for osteopathic physicians as medical officers in the Navy (Public Law 604, 79th Cong.); and as medical officers in the United States Public Health Service (Public Law 425, 80th Cong.), which, under Executive order, is at this time a military organization. The Army is also authorized to grant medical commissions to osteopathic graduates. During the Seventy-seventh Congress (Public Law 580, 77th Cong.), Congress specifically authorized osteopathic graduates as interns in Army hospitals with the understanding, as evident in the hearings at the time, that such internships lead to commissions as medical officers in the Medical Reserve Corps. In 1946 Congress provided for osteopathic graduates as physicians in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration (Public Law 293, 79th Cong.).

Mr. President, I think we can dispose of this amendment, if the Senate wishes to vote on the merits of it, by this one argument: All branches of the armed service use certified osteopathic physicians. Inasmuch as in the past we have incorporated in a series of Federal laws specific authorization for the use of osteopathic physicians, then certainly in

this draft law they should be placed on the same basis as medical doctors and dentists.

Mr. President, with that statement I close, except I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the letter which I have received this morning from the osteopathic physicians, and also a copy of Bulletin No. 41, issued by the National Headquarters of the selective-service system on December 14, 1942, with special reference to the drafting of osteopathic physicians.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8, 1948.

In re Morse osteopathic amendments to S. 2655.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Section 4 (c) makes it clear that doctors of medicine and dentists up to 45 years of age will not be inducted unless the needs of the Armed Forces for their professional services require it. That is in deference to the acknowledged fact that there is an over-all shortage of medical and dental care for the civilian population, and the draft should not be permitted to aggravate that shortage except to the extent absolutely necessary to meet the medical and dental needs of the Armed Forces.

Doctors of osteopathy render the same scope of services in many States as do doctors of medicine. They are licensed in all the States. They practice obstetrics in all but about five States. They are licensed in major operative surgery in more than 30 States. They staff more than 300 hospitals. In a number of jurisdictions they evidence their comparable training by taking the same State examination and receiving the same or equivalent licenses to practice as do doctors of medicine.

Congress provided for osteopathic physicians as medical officers in the Navy (Public Law 604, 79th Cong.); and as medical officers in the United States Public Health Service (Public Law 425, 80th Cong.), which under Executive order is at this time a military organization. The Army is also authorized to grant medical commissions to osteopathic graduates. During the Seventy-seventh Congress (Public Law 580, 77th Cong.), Congress specifically authorized osteopathic graduates as interns in Army hospitals with the understanding as evident in the hearings at the time, that such internships lead to commissions as medical officers in the Medical Reserve Corps. In 1946, Congress provided for osteopathic graduates as physicians in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration (Public Law 293, 79th Cong.).

In his opening speech on the bill, Senator GURNEY explained as recorded on page 7002 that osteopathic physicians were not included with doctors of medicine and dentists because, said the Senator: "The shortage of doctors (M. D.'s) and dentists left in civilian communities was acute—the same cannot be said to have been true as regards the others." The Senator apparently overlooked the fact that as early as December 1942, the War Manpower Commission certified to Selective Service that the practice of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and veterinary medicine were critical occupations, and the Selective Service System after citing that fact issued a directive on December 14, 1942, listing doctors of osteopathy with doctors of medicine and dentists as engaged in critical occupations. (See attached Selective Service Occupational Bulletin No. 41.) That grouping of doctors

of medicine, dentists, and doctors of osteopathy in the same category by selective service continued thereafter throughout the tenure of selective service.

Doctors of osteopathy should not be drafted except for the purpose of filling the needs of the Armed Forces for their professional services, and then only from communities which can best spare their professional services. To that end, it is vital that section 4 (c) shall expressly include members of the osteopathic profession.

Very truly yours,

L. L. GOURLEY,
Legal Counsel,
American Osteopathic Association.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1942.

Occupational Bulletin No. 41.

Effective: Immediately.

Subject: Doctors, dentists, veterinarians, and osteopaths.

1. Persons qualified.

There are certain persons trained, qualified, or skilled in the practice of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and osteopathy, who, if engaged in the practice of their respective professions, are in a position to perform vital service in activities essential to war production and to the support of the war effort, and in activities the maintenance of which is necessary to the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

2. Critical occupations.

The War Manpower Commission has certified that in the practice of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and osteopathy, and in training and preparation therefor, there are critical occupations, which, for the proper discharge of the duties involved, require a high degree of training, qualification, or skill. Attached is a list of "critical occupations" in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and osteopathy.

3. Consideration of occupational classification.

The War Manpower Commission has certified that there are serious shortages of persons trained, qualified, or skilled to engage in these critical occupations. Accordingly, careful consideration for occupational classification should be given to all persons trained, qualified, or skilled in these critical occupations and engaged in activities essential to the health, safety, and welfare necessary to war production and essential to the support of the war effort, and persons in training and preparation therefor.

4. Students in preprofessional training.

A registrant who is in training and preparation as a premedical, premedical, preveterinarian, or preosteopathic student, pursuing courses in liberal arts or sciences in a recognized university or college, may be considered for occupational deferment after completion of his first academic year in such preprofessional course, and thereafter, if he is a full-time student in good standing, if he continues to maintain good standing in such course of study, and if it is certified by the institution that he is competent and that he gives promise of successful completion of such course of study and acquiring the necessary degree of training, qualification, or skill.

5. Students in professional schools.

A registrant who is in training and preparation as a medical, dental, veterinary, or osteopathic student, in a recognized medical school, dental school, school of veterinary medicine, or school of osteopathy, shall be considered for occupational classification during the period of such professional course, provided he is a full-time student in good standing, he continues to maintain good standing in such course of study, and if it is certified by the institution that he is competent and that he gives promise of the successful completion of such course of study

and acquiring the necessary degree of training, qualification, or skill to become a recognized medical doctor, dentist, doctor of veterinary medicine, or osteopath.

6. Interns.

A registrant who has completed his preprofessional and professional training and preparation as a medical doctor, dentist, or osteopath, and who is undertaking further studies in a hospital, institution, or dental clinic, giving a recognized internship, shall be considered for occupational classification so long as he continues the internship, but for a period not to exceed one complete year.

7. Opportunity to engage in profession.

When a registrant has completed his training and preparation in a recognized college or university, or in a recognized hospital, institution, or dental clinic, and has acquired the high degree of training, qualification, or skill in one of these professional fields, such registrant should then be given the opportunity to become engaged in the practice of his profession in the armed forces, or in a civilian activity necessary to the public health, safety, or welfare, necessary to war production, or essential to the support of the war effort. In many instances following graduation from a recognized college or university, or the completion of an internship, a certain period of time will be required in the placing of such persons in an essential activity. When a registrant has been deferred as a necessary man in order to complete his training and preparation, it is only logical that his deferment should continue until he has had an opportunity to put his professional training and skill to use in the best interest of the Nation. Accordingly, following graduation in any of these professional fields or following an internship, a registrant should be considered for further occupational classification for a period of not to exceed 60 days, in order that he may have an opportunity to engage in a critical occupation of his profession in the armed forces, war production, support of the war effort, or in an activity essential to civilian health, safety, or welfare, provided that during such period the registrant is making an honest and diligent effort to become so engaged.

8. Deferment permitted whether or not commission is pending.

The official statement of any recognized premedical, premedical, preveterinary, or preosteopathic college or university, the official statement of any recognized medical, dental, veterinary, or osteopathic college or university, or the official statement of any hospital, institution, or dental clinic, giving a recognized internship, showing that a registrant satisfies the requirements of this bulletin, shall be sufficient for the consideration of such registrant for occupational classification on occupational grounds solely. Registrants will be considered for occupational classification as prescribed in this bulletin without regard for the fact that a commission in the armed forces may be granted to him or is pending.

9. Procurement and Assignment Service.

In order that every doctor, dentist, or veterinarian may render the greatest professional service to the Nation, the President has created the Procurement and Assignment Service for the purpose of gathering information with respect to the supply of qualified medical doctors, dentists, and doctors of veterinary medicine. To work with headquarters of the Procurement and Assignment Service, there have been appointed for each State and the District of Columbia, a State chairman for medical doctors, a State chairman for dentists, and a State chairman for doctors of veterinary medicine. When considering the classification of any registrant who is a medical doctor, dentist, or doctor of veterinary medicine, the Director of Selective Service desires that local boards,

through the State Director, shall consult with the respective State chairman of the Procurement and Assignment Service.

10. List of State chairmen.

Names and addresses of the respective State chairman of the Procurement and Assignment Service will be provided to State directors from time to time.

11. Effective period of this bulletin.

This bulletin is effective until July 1, 1943, unless sooner amended. During the effective period of this bulletin the War Manpower Commission is giving further study to the training and preparation and utilization of persons trained in these professional fields.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

OCCUPATIONAL BULLETIN No. 41

CRITICAL OCCUPATIONS—MEDICAL, DENTAL, VETERINARY, AND OSTEOPATHIC

Preprofessional student after completion of his first academic year in such preprofessional course: Premedical, premedical, preveterinary, preosteopathic.

Professional students during full professional course following completion of preprofessional course: Medical, dental, veterinary, osteopathic.

Intern in hospital, institution, or dental clinic, giving recognized internship following completion of professional studies: Medical interns, dental interns, osteopathic interns.

Persons engaged in practice of their respective professions: Medical doctors, dentists, doctors of veterinary medicine (engaged in care of animals raised and maintained for work or food or in the inspection of meat food products), osteopaths.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we used osteopathic physicians during the war. If we are going to make use of them in the future, I think we should put them on the same basis as medical doctors and dentists.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement by Dr. Chester D. Swope, of the American Osteopathic Association, on the Selective Service Act of 1948.

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

STATEMENT BY DR. CHESTER D. SWOPE, AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION, ON SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

SUMMARY

During World War II, doctors of osteopathy and a number of dentists and some doctors of medicine were drafted as privates.

It took 7 years beyond high school to train them as doctors, yet not a single osteopathic physician was commissioned and utilized as a doctor. They served as privates or petty officers.

Such waste of medical manpower is indefensible, but it will happen again unless this legislation shall require that every osteopathic physician selected for service under the act shall be commissioned as a medical officer and utilized in his professional capacity. Such an amendment is submitted.

The doctor of osteopathy is trained in drug therapy and major surgery. In a number of States he passes the same State board examination in those subjects, and receives the same license to practice, as do the medical graduates. But he is especially schooled in body mechanics, and skilled in manipulative treatment restoring the proper relationship between the structure and function of the body, and it is in this phase of practice that the members of the armed services need him most.

Any director of aviation training would agree with Capt. Tom Hamilton, Director of Naval Aviation Training during World War II, that aviation trainees need osteopathic care.

Regular and Reserve medical officers who served with them during World War II recommended that doctors of osteopathy be commissioned as medical officers. They could then have been assigned to aviation training centers, or otherwise used in their professional capacity, but service medical policy denied every application for appointment.

The contention of the military and naval medical departments is that medical appointments for osteopathic physicians would bring about disharmony. The same argument was made when the Veterans' Administration law was pending before Congress and it was repudiated by the Congress when the law was passed. There has been no disharmony in the Veterans' Administration.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY DR. CHESTER D. SWOPE, WASHINGTON, D. C., CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS, AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION, ON SENATE COMMITTEE PRINT NO. 5, ENTITLED "SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948," SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, APRIL 23, 1948

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity of submitting a statement in regard to Senate Committee Print No. 5, cited as the Selective Service Act of 1948.

The American Osteopathic Association, you may be sure, favors revival of selective service whenever Congress finds the national security requires it.

Some 11,000 osteopathic physicians or surgeons are legally licensed and practicing in all the States, and approximately 80 percent are members of this association.

Six schools of osteopathy and surgery and sixty-seven training hospitals are inspected annually and accredited by the association. These institutions are recognized by the State licensure agencies, and their graduates are acceptable to the Veterans' Administration and the United States Public Health Service for appointments as medical officers.

All osteopathic colleges require a minimum of 2 years' preprofessional college work (60 percent of current freshman classes have had 3 years or more), and 4 years' professional college work, making 7 years' training (including 1-year internship).

An annual average of 442 graduate from these schools in normal years. Current graduating classes are very small due to unavailability of preprofessional students during war years.

There is an acknowledged shortage of physicians and dentists serving the civilian population. An expansion of the armed forces will increase the over-all medical manpower needs because service personnel require more doctors and dentists per thousand than do civilian personnel.

The national interest, therefore, requires that the professional services of all physicians (allopathic, homeopathic, and osteopathic) and dentists shall be utilized to capacity.

During World War II doctors of osteopathy and a number of dentists and some doctors of medicine were drafted as privates and their professional services wasted.

It took 7 years beyond high school to train them as doctors, yet not a single osteopathic physician was commissioned and utilized as a doctor. They served as privates or petty officers.

Such waste of medical manpower is indefensible, but the same thing will happen again unless this legislation shall require that every osteopathic physician who is selected for service under the act shall be

commissioned as a medical officer and utilized in his professional capacity.

The doctor of osteopathy is trained in drug therapy and major surgery. In a number of States he passes the same State board examination in those subjects, and receives the same license to practice, as do the medical graduates. But he is especially schooled in body mechanics and skilled in manipulative treatment restoring the proper relationship between the structure and function of the body, and it is in this phase of practice that the members of the armed services need him most.

Capt. Tom Hamilton, director of naval aviation training during World War II, asked for osteopathic care for his trainees. In his official recommendation he said:

"The medical staff should be carefully selected for these centers. Competent doctors are necessary. However, their governing policy must be the same as the rest of the centers; namely, to produce strong, tough men and, outside of necessary treatments, there will be no mollycoddling of these cadets. Certain injuries are inevitable in such a program, but due to precautions for safety having been taken, the whole program should not be allowed to slow down by fear of contracting injuries among a small minority of the students, thus softening the mental attitude of the majority. In addition to a regular sick-bay or hospital staff, one or two sports physicians should be attached to the athletic staff to administer to the bruises, sprains, etc., as well as to consult on matters of posture, instruct in matters of camp hygiene, etc. A staff of trainers should work under the direction of these sports doctors. At the risk of being branded for heresy, I further recommend that one of these sports doctors be an osteopath or one full acquainted with osteopathy methods."

Any director of aviation training would agree with Captain Hamilton, but his recommendation came to naught because it was stymied by Navy medical policy.

Assuming that aviation trainees ought to have osteopathic care, no so-called policy should be permitted to deprive them of it. There is pending before Congress a measure for greatly expanding the Air Force, which will require many thousands of trainees—a compelling reason that this legislation require medical commissions for osteopathic physicians selected under the act, in order that their professional services can be made available, particularly in the air-training centers.

Time after time during World War II the Congress indicated in annual appropriation acts that doctors of osteopathy should be given medical commissions by the Navy. Finally, a permanent statute was enacted, approved August 2, 1946, as follows:

"The President, in his discretion, is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy as commissioned medical officers in the Navy, in such numbers as the President should determine to be necessary to meet the needs of the naval service for officers trained and qualified in osteopathy" (title 34, sec. 21b, U. S. C. A.).

The bottleneck of naval medical policy has thus far prevented appointments under that law.

When the question of appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration was pending before the House Veterans Committee in October, 1945, Gen. Paul R. Hawley said: "We used osteopaths in the rehabilitation hospitals in the European theater of operations. That service in one hospital, was headed up by a man who was both a doctor of osteopathy and a doctor of medicine, and the men who worked under his supervisions were doctors of osteopathy." Yet none of these men were given commis-

sions as medical officers in the Army. Congress passed the bill for osteopathic appointments as medical officers in the Veterans Administration, and several doctors of osteopathy have been appointed. The Veterans' Administration law reads:

"Any person to be eligible for appointment in the Department of Medicine and Surgery must— * * * in the Medical Service—hold the degree of doctor of medicine or of doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator, have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia" (title 38, sec. 15d, U. S. C. A.).

By Executive order, the United States Public Health Service is at this time a part of the armed forces. By act of Congress, approved February 28, 1948, osteopathic graduates are expressly eligible for appointment as commissioned medical officers in the Public Health Service, and the Public Health Service has indicated that appointments will be made. The law reads:

"Graduates of colleges of osteopathy whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy in a majority of the States of the United States, or approved by a body or bodies acceptable to the Administrator, shall be eligible, subject to the other provisions of this act, for appointment as commissioned medical officers in the Public Health Service" (title 42, sec. 209d, U. S. C. A.).

It is not a question of professional qualifications which has kept osteopathic physicians from obtaining medical commissions in the Army and Navy. The contention of the military and naval medical departments is that medical appointments for osteopathic physicians would bring about disharmony. The same argument was made when the Veterans' Administration law was pending before Congress and it was repudiated by the Congress when the law was passed. There has been no disharmony in the Veterans' Administration.

Letters from osteopathic physicians in the services during World War II indicated that many medical officers felt that the osteopathic physicians should be given medical commissions so that there would be no question about their right to render professional care for the members of the armed services.

Medical officers with whom they served offered to vouch for their professional background and that they were excellent officer material. For example, regular and reserve Navy medical officers with whom he served recommended Dr. Samuel Henderson Scott, an osteopathic physician, for a commission in the Medical Corps of the Navy. Their letters of recommendation are included in full at the end of this statement.

Doctors of osteopathy are professionally trained to administer penicillin, sulfas, streptomycin, narcotics, and other drugs, and in some 300 osteopathic hospitals throughout the country they are competently performing the full range of major surgical operations. Many are certified by American osteopathic boards in the various specialties.

Osteopathic physicians definitely are professionally equipped for general medical assignment in the armed services. As they excel in manipulative therapy, however, their professional services ought to be utilized in that field wherever possible.

To insure maximum utilization of osteopathic manpower both in serving the needs of the armed services and the civilian population, the following amendments are respectfully requested, namely:

1. Sec. 105 (c), strike the words "member of the medical, dental, and veterinary professions" and insert in lieu thereof the words "doctors of medicine, doctors of osteopathy, dentists, and veterinarians".

2. Sec. 105, add a new subsection (p) as follows:

"(p) Any individual selected for service under this act (1) who is a graduate of a medical or osteopathic or dental school whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy or dentistry in a majority of the States of the United States or who was so eligible at the time of his graduation; and (2) whose physical and mental fitness for such service has been satisfactorily determined, shall be eligible to apply for a commission as an officer in the Medical Reserve Corps or Dental Reserve Corps of the United States Army or the United States Navy, and upon such application shall, in lieu of induction into the armed forces of the United States for such service, be granted such a commission and subject to order into active service."

The purpose of this amendment is to insure that doctors of osteopathy who are taken into the armed services shall be commissioned as medical officers and utilized in their professional capacity.

The inclusion of doctors of medicine and dentists in the amendment is not intended as a commitment of those professions, although the American Medical Association suggested a similar amendment during World War II (p. 22, hearing on S. 783, 77th Cong. Senate Committee on Military Affairs).

3. Immediately following the language proposed in amendment No. 2, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(q) (1) Students who are pursuing pre-professional courses of study in recognized colleges or universities who shall present an affidavit from the dean of such school or university that they are full-time students who are competent and give promise of the successful completion of such courses of study and an affidavit from a medical or osteopathic or dental school whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy or dentistry in a majority of the States of the United States that they are accepted for admission for professional studies upon completion of such preprofessional courses; (2) students who are preparing for the degree of doctor of medicine or doctor of osteopathy or doctor of dental surgery or doctor of dental medicine at medical or osteopathic or dental schools whose graduates are eligible for licensure in a majority of the States of the United States who shall present an affidavit from the dean of the school that they are full-time students who are competent and give promise of successful completion of the preparation and training for such professional degree; (3) hospital interns and resident physicians and hospital dental interns and resident dentists who are graduates of medical schools or osteopathic schools or dental schools whose graduates are eligible for licensure in a majority of the States of the United States or who were so eligible at the time of their graduation from such medical or osteopathic or dental schools, but for a period not to exceed one complete year; (4) teachers at medical or osteopathic or dental schools whose graduates are eligible for licensure as doctors of medicine or doctors of osteopathy or doctors of dental surgery or doctors of dental medicine in a majority of the States of the United States who shall present an affidavit from the dean of the school and from two members of the executive committee of the faculty of such school that they are teachers essential to maintain teaching in such institutions shall be exempt from service (but not from registration) under this act."

This amendment substantially confirms the policies pursued by selective service during World War II, except that deferrability of preprofessional students would be uninterrupted.

The sources of supply of medical manpower must be preserved.

National headquarters of selective service and the local boards in general during World War II were cognizant of the necessity for insuring an adequate number of trainees in the healing arts, and they are to be commended for the sympathetic understanding with which they approached the problem. They did a very creditable job under great difficulty.

This amendment will aid the Selective Service System.

UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION,
FLOYD BENNETT FIELD,
Brooklyn, N. Y., November 23, 1942.
To Whom It May Concern:

I have known Samuel Henderson Scott, pharmacist's mate (second class), for the past 6 months and have been deeply impressed by his ability and conscientious endeavor. He is an outstanding young man, with an excellent professional background.

I have found him adaptable, cooperative, and highly personable. He is of excellent officer material, and I sincerely trust that he will be so honored to receive a commission in the Medical Corps of the United States Naval Reserve.

SAMUEL ZURIK,
Lieutenant (MC), United States Navy.

UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION,
FLOYD BENNETT FIELD,
Brooklyn, N. Y.
To Whom It May Concern:

Samuel Scott has been attached to this station for the past 7 months, as a pharmacist's mate (second class). During this time he has been in charge of the physiotherapy room and has also set up the X-ray department of a new 50-bed dispensary. He has shown himself to be well trained in physiotherapy and X-ray work and capable of taking charge of and running either of these departments by himself.

In addition to this, he has been used on other hospital corps details and has proved to be capable of handling any of them. He is neat in his personal appearance and about his work and intelligent and well educated. He accepts responsibility readily, can be depended upon to carry out assignments, and I would unhesitatingly recommend him for a commission in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

S. C. BOSTIC,
Lieutenant Commander (MC),
United States Naval Reserve.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the temporary absence of the chairman of the committee I should like to reply briefly to the Senator from Oregon. The committee omitted osteopaths because it did not want to have anyone specially drafted unless absolutely necessary. The committee was informed by Army authorities that they could get all the osteopaths they needed on the voluntary basis when needed. It will be noted that in line 7, on page 7, the President may call full "allied specialist categories" if they are needed.

I personally go to osteopaths at times. I have great respect for them, but I see no need for putting anybody into the pending measure to be drafted, to be taken from his ordinary profession, unless absolutely necessary for the good of the service.

I call attention to the fact that the committee omitted veterinarians, who are in the House bill. Veterinarians were included in the previous law. The committee felt that veterinarians were not needed in the bill at this time, so that provision was omitted.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted, because I think we should not include anybody within the provisions of the bill unless it is absolutely necessary for the good of the service. We can get osteopaths if we need them. We respect them. The Army uses them, but it can get them on a voluntary basis.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the argument made by the Senator from Massachusetts was made before the committee. The osteopaths themselves do not agree with the Senator. I read, for example, from their letter to me, in which they say:

In his opening speech on the bill, Senator GURNEY explained as recorded on page 7002 that osteopathic physicians were not included with doctors of medicine and dentists because, said the Senator: "The shortage of doctors (M. D.'s) and dentists left in civilian communities was acute—the same cannot be said to have been true as regards the others." The Senator apparently overlooked the fact that as early as December 1942, the War Manpower Commission certified to selective service that the practice of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and veterinary medicine were critical occupations, and the Selective Service System, after citing that fact, issued a directive on December 14, 1942, listing doctors of osteopathy with doctors of medicine and dentists as engaged in critical occupations. (See attached selective service occupational bulletin No. 41.) That grouping of doctors of medicine, dentists, and doctors of osteopathy in the same category by selective service continued thereafter throughout the tenure of selective service.

The failure to include osteopaths in this particular bill has created great alarm and consternation among this branch of the medical profession. Rightly or wrongly, the fact nevertheless is that they fear it is an attempt to weaken their position in Federal legislation. They have been included in the Federal legislation I have already cited during the debate, and they believe the discrimination against them which they feel is contained in the draft bill will do great damage to their profession. I think it is a complete answer to the Senator from Massachusetts to say that, of course, under the law, if not one of them is needed by way of the draft, he is not to be drafted. What harm is there, then, in including them as we have done in other Federal statutes along with the doctors and dentists.

In answer to the argument that veterinarians are not included in this proposed draft law, but were included in the original draft law, it should not be forgotten that when the war first started there was still a great need for veterinarians in the armed forces but since then the need for veterinarians in large measure has been eliminated. We have eliminated all of the horse units in the Army. I understand that for the most part in the later days of the war, veterinarians were used primarily for the inspection of meat. That was a tremendous waste of professional manpower, because veterinarians were not needed to perform the perfunctory work of inspecting meat.

If we are to recognize, as we do in Federal statutes, that osteopathy and the service of osteopaths should be made available to men in the armed services—and we do make them available in all

the Army and Navy hospitals—then certainly we should not discriminate against them by discriminating against them in the pending bill.

I reiterate no harm would be done by including them. If in fact they are not needed, they need not be drafted. They should be given the same treatment under this law as is accorded to doctors and dentists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to reply with a word or two to what the Senator from Oregon has said. Osteopaths are included in affirmative legislation concerning the Navy, and, I think, the Army, where they are on equal terms with doctors and other professional men. It is nothing derogatory to the osteopathic profession not to include them among those to be drafted, when it is unnecessary to draft them. I certainly hope we shall not put any more men under the draft provision, no matter what the professions or categories may be, than is absolutely necessary. That is the reason we reduced the age limit from 30 to 26, in order to leave free as many people as possible and still obtain the necessary men to fill up the armed forces.

I repeat, sir, I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered H, submitted by the Senator from Oregon. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MORSE. A division, Mr. President.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to ask consideration of my amendment lettered "G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the word "fifth" and substitute in lieu thereof "second."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is an exceedingly important amendment. It is one on which I trust I may have the courtesy of a yea-and-nay vote. It is an amendment proposing on page 62 of the bill, in line 25, to change the word "fifth" to the word "second." In my opinion, this amendment has tremendous national implications. I express the view that in a national referendum the American people, by an overwhelming vote, would vote for my amendment, because the American people are well aware of the fact that we are at peace. We are proposing a draft law to meet what we have come to recognize as an emergency situation. There is great alarm in America, and there is cause for it, that we may be moving too far in the direction of an over-militarized state. I think my record in support of necessary preparedness has been perfectly clear through the many weeks in which we have considered this bill. I am convinced that the international situation is such that we need to take some rather drastic steps to build up our military establishment so that we shall be in position to enforce

the peace if some untoward affair or incident should thrust us, all of a sudden into a war.

I have said on this floor in times past, Mr. President, that a false sense of security also is entertained by too many Americans. Too many of our people do not realize the low ebb to which our preparedness has presently fallen. But meeting an immediate emergency is one thing, and passing a bill which at least gives sanction to a program for a 5-year draft is another thing. It is no answer to say to me that Congress, at any time it will, can vote to repeal the draft law. I think most of our people recognize that once we pass a statute such as this, which authorizes a draft for 5 years, the chances are great that we shall have a 5-year draft. Furthermore, I think we are dealing with a subject matter which is so close to the interests, the rights, and the freedom of the American people that there should be an affirmative requirement in the bill that Congress shall, in 2 years, automatically review the question as to whether the draft shall be continued.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator recall how long the draft was to last under the bill which was enacted in 1940?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Senator inform me as to that.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will refresh his recollection, was it not 1 year?

Mr. MORSE. In the first instance.

Mr. PEPPER. The act was renewed at a subsequent time. I was wondering if the Senator thought that the likelihood of danger is greater and more imminent at the present time than it was in 1940 when Congress enacted a 1-year draft law.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution, because it helps clinch my point. Of course the danger was much greater then than it is at the present time.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator feels, no doubt, in the advocacy of his amendment, that if the danger is still imminent 2 years from now Congress should review the legislation—

Mr. MORSE. It should be made the responsibility of Congress 2 years hence to take affirmative action on the continuation of the draft, if the emergency still exists at that time. The duty should be placed on Congress to review the matter and vote as to whether the draft should be continued.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I imagine it is the Senator's opinion, as at least it is mine, that while we should prepare the country for any emergency, at the same time we should look forward to the happy day when all countries will discontinue selective service and all forms of compulsory military training and adopt a genuine disarmament program.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Surely, if we find it necessary to continue this program, it can be done in 2 years.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. President, the next point I desire to make is that if we are believers in the democratic processes, as are all Members of this body, then I think my amendment should be adopted so that the continuation of the draft by way of placing an affirmative obligation on Congress 2 years hence either to continue the draft or do away with it will be clearly a political issue in the elections 2 years hence. In 1950 we shall once again be conducting a Federal election. I think this is an issue which the people should have brought before them in that election. Are we afraid to give them a chance to consider it at an election? I hope not. My amendment makes clear that we are willing to submit this issue to a political campaign discussion and decision by the voters at the polls. If at that time the emergency still exists, then, of course, the people of the United States, given the facts, will instruct their candidates to continue the draft, but if, in their opinion, an emergency does not exist, then I think they will make that fact crystal clear in the election. Under my amendment the continuation of the draft will automatically require affirmative action by Congress in 1950.

It will do something else, Mr. President, which is the next point I want to make. It will serve clear notice on the Military Establishment that by passing this bill, if it contains my amendment, we enter into no sort of a moral commitment, directly or indirectly, to the Military Establishment for a continuation of the draft beyond 2 years. Having had an opportunity, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to watch the way in which the Military Establishment works, I say it will be very advisable for us to make perfectly clear by way of my amendment that the Military Establishment had better cut its cloth accordingly, knowing full well that in 2 years the draft issue will automatically pass before us for review and affirmative or negative action at that time.

The last point I desire to make, Mr. President, is that I think passing this bill with the 5-year clause in it would have some very serious repercussions on international relations. I am convinced that we are a peaceful nation. I believe many foreign peoples believe that we are a peaceful nation. But I do not think that we should fool ourselves into thinking that the peoples in all freedom-loving countries are absolutely certain as to what our motives are. A great battle of ideologies is proceeding in the world. There is a powerful propaganda machine in the form of Soviet Russia that takes advantage of every opportunity to distort, to twist, and to falsify the position of the United States. I say, Mr. President, that leaving the bill as it now stands, with the 5-year provision, will be looked upon by the Russian propagandists as an opportunity to give the impression, false though it will be, but nevertheless to give the impression, that we have undertaken by passage of a draft

bill a highly warlike policy. It will be represented by the Russians as a commitment on our part to a 5-year draft and to the building up of the tremendous army that can be built up through a 5-year draft procedure for war purposes.

I said yesterday, in a speech on another subject, and I want to repeat today, that I think we are also engaged, Mr. President, in a fight for peace in the world. I do not think we should do any unnecessary act—and I underline the word "unnecessary"—which would give aid and comfort to those falsifiers in the world who would try to make us appear to be a warlike nation.

I think my point is completely proven when I say that inserting the word "second" for the word "fifth" on line 25, page 62 of the bill, will in no way weaken the bill. If it will weaken the bill I want to hear in what manner it will weaken it. Rather my amendment reaffirms a pledge to the world on the part of the United States that we are striving for peace, that we seek not to follow warlike measures. But a 5-year draft proposal will be interpreted to be rather irreconcilable with the concept that we are seeking only after peace.

Therefore, in conclusion, Mr. President, for the latter reason, and for the reasons previously emphasized, my amendment is consonant with the democratic process in its best aspects. I say that because my amendment will place the clear affirmative duty upon the Congress to take action 2 years hence. Further, my amendment will clearly make the issue a part of the political campaign in 1950, as I think it should be, and therefore, I recommend to the Senate the adoption of the amendment. It does not deprive the Senate of a right to take affirmative action on the continuation of the draft in 2 years and it gives to the people a clear opportunity to express themselves at the ballot box on this time.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I understand that the pending bill provides that its provisions, with certain exceptions, shall terminate on the fifth anniversary after the date when the act becomes effective.

Mr. MORSE. The exact language is, "shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the fifth anniversary of the date of enactment of this act or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date."

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. And the Senator's proposal is that it shall cease to be operative on the second anniversary, unless the Congress sees fit to take affirmative action to continue it?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I believe the Senator said, in effect, that we now need some agency to make a peace, because the United Nations was intended to preserve peace, but it never started out with any peace, and for that reason

the Senator thinks we should now strengthen our Military Establishment, with the hope that that will contribute to our intention and our program and desire to make peace in the world, which we can then turn over to an international organization to keep. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The position of the junior Senator from Oregon on that point is that after careful study of the evidence which came before the Armed Services Committee, of which he is a member, he became convinced that our lack of preparedness today would endanger the security of the American people if some international incident should throw us into a sudden war. Furthermore, the noncooperative attitude of Soviet Russia, not only in the United Nations, but in all international dealings with us since VJ-day, convinced the Senator from Oregon that we should strengthen our Military Establishment so as to make perfectly clear to Russia that we are a united people, determined to enforce the peace.

Therefore, I think an emergency in fact does exist, but I do not believe the Senate should pass a draft measure containing a 5-year provision, when the Congress could take affirmative action, under my amendment, at the end of 2 years, to decide whether the same emergency then existed to justify a continuation of the draft.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. And if we could get the cooperation of Soviet Russia for world peace, would the Senator from Oregon then favor international control of the atomic bomb, if we had the right of inspection in other countries, as we would give it to them?

Mr. MORSE. It is my prayer, I may say to the Senator from Virginia, that in the not too distant future we can, by international negotiations and agreements, bring to an end the dangers of another war, which would mean, of course, that the atomic bomb would have to be brought under international control, with such conditions and safeguards as those to which the Senator alludes. It means, in the last analysis, what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has pleaded for so many times on the floor of the Senate; namely, recognition on the part of all the peoples of the world that we must stop the mad race in armaments, if we are to save civilization itself.

It means also a recognition on the part of all the peoples of the world that no nation is going to win the next war no matter when it comes. Chaos alone will be the victor, and we in this country, if we become involved in the type of war in which we could right now become involved with Russia, would find that we would lose this very precious thing we call our private-property economy. A war would mean an almost total regimentation of the economy of the United States for a great many years if not permanently.

We must win the fight for peace, but I recognize, as one who knows that, after all, we must keep ourselves in a position to protect ourselves from an aggressor if he insists on committing aggressive acts, that we are in no position today to

defend ourselves against Soviet Russia, at least in Europe, if she follows an aggressive course of action.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In other words, as Winston Churchill recently said, no one can condone the suicide of a state, but if we protect our own safety, then the Senator from Oregon, like the Senator from Virginia, would welcome an international program for world disarmament.

Mr. MORSE. That is a correct statement of my views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I will say that under perhaps more normal circumstances I should be inclined to favor it, but I think it is only fair to say that we have witnessed, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, a congestion, to say the least, which has prevented action by the Senate and the House on legislation which it is generally agreed is essential to the national defense. There is still grave doubt whether we shall be able to have a bill on this subject passed at all at this session of the Congress.

We have been faced with a situation in the Congress this year which I, for one, do not want to see repeated 2 years from now. A great mass of important legislation is being held up and blocked because of the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves. For that reason, Mr. President, I believe that there is more soundness and reason in acting on the bill as it came from the committee, so that what it provides for will be in existence for 5 years, and so that we will not confront this type of a situation two short years from now.

No man is wise enough to look into a crystal ball and foretell what conditions will be 2 years or 5 years from now. Of course, we all join with the Senator from Oregon in hoping that the peace of the world will be preserved for ourselves, our generation, and for our children, but I am convinced we are more apt to preserve the peace of the world if we demonstrate beyond any doubt whatever that this Nation is going to maintain its national defense in A-1 order, that the means of defense are going to exist in fact and not on blueprints.

I do not think there is a person sitting in the Kremlin today who is going to be awed in any degree by the mere discussion of an air force, the discussion of a navy, or the discussion of an army. Those men are realistic, and the only thing to which they will pay any attention is our having an air force in being, and an army and a navy in being.

I merely wish to say in conclusion that I am not impressed by the argument that those who would misrepresent the American position abroad will use the enactment of this bill as propaganda. It matters not what the Government of the United States does, what position we take on any side of any international issue or in the matter of national defense; whatever we do, whenever we do it, it is going to be misrepresented time after time. That is the Communist technique. We have to expect it, and I

for one certainly shall not be guided in my determination of national policies which are needed by the fact that we may be subjected to some criticism from that sector of the world.

Mr. President, I am convinced that we are not going to save the peace of the world by following the program the world followed at Munich. Rather than it being the road to peace I think that is the sure road to war.

I happened to have served in the Army for 3 years as an enlisted man and an officer. I have a son who is 17, and who will soon be 18. I wish it were not necessary for the Congress to enact legislation of this kind.

We talk about the rights of young men as American citizens, and I agree that they should be proud of having those rights, but they also have responsibilities of citizenship, and being prepared to defend their Nation in time of war is one of those responsibilities.

I think by and large the committee has done an excellent job with a difficult bill. I hope that, without too much further delay, we may act on the remainder of the amendments, and can pass the bill by an overwhelming vote in the Senate of the United States. I hope our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol Building will take early action to do the same, and I think if that news goes out to the world we will have made our greatest contribution to preserving the peace.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will not prevail.

I agree with the very eloquent and pertinent remarks made by the Senator from California. We all hope and pray that the present emergency will be a short one; that the present crisis will not last long. But one reason why it will be a short one, one reason why it will not last long is that we are strong. The crisis will not last long if we show that we mean business, if we show that we can back up with force our word in the United Nations and in the various councils if it is necessary to do so.

The committee discussed the question of whether to provide for a period of 2 years or 5 years, and it decided on the longer period for the very simple reason that the universal training provision was eliminated. Therefore the selective-service bill was made to cover a maximum of 5 years in order that we could build up our trained reserves. The purpose at this time is to build up our trained reserves in order to strengthen our Nation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon said, "Let us make the question an issue in the next election campaign if necessary to show that we can end the draft." I call the Senate's attention to the fact that the Senator's amendment would simply reduce the period from 5 years to 2 years, and would allow Congress to shut off the operation of the bill even sooner than in 2 years if necessary. It would require the passage of a joint resolution by Congress to extend the period in 1950 if it were proposed that we

extend it at that time. I personally agree with the report of the committee to the effect that it is much better to provide for the longer period. Then, when we are satisfied respecting our trained reserves, when we are satisfied that world conditions have become stabilized, we can suspend the operation of the law by the enactment of a joint resolution. We can stop the operation of the law 10 days after we put it into effect if we want to, but in the meantime it will give us an opportunity to build up the trained reserves and afford the men who are in the age group affected by the bill an opportunity to be trained. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will not prevail.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon. I intend to vote for the bill itself in whatever form it is finally presented to the Senate for action. I will do so because I am certain that in the circumstances in which the world finds itself today an adequate military establishment is necessary for the security of this Nation and its people. I could not in conscience fail to vote for a measure which will assure minimum security in the coming years. I will vote for every measure which will protect the country.

I shall vote for it also because I believe that, properly used, it will be an instrument toward peace. As an expression by the Congress of its determination to support the foreign policy of this country it will give hope and confidence to countries which are struggling for economic and political stability, and it can dissuade aggression.

Nevertheless I do not want to vote for the bill without giving expression to my own belief that it should be limited solely to the actual duration of the emergency, an emergency which, to my mind, gives us the only right we have to vote a draft measure in peacetime. I make that statement, Mr. President, because it is my conviction that the conscription of men and enforced military training in peacetime are not in accord with and are in fact repugnant to the democratic traditions of our country. For that reason I do not favor the provisions in the bill which assume that the emergency which makes the proposed action necessary will exist for 5 years, or that enforced military service will be required for 2 years. The subject can be reviewed by the Congress next year to determine whether such an emergency exists at that time as to make necessary the continuation of the draft which, I repeat, is not justified in peacetime without the existence of some great emergency.

Mr. President, I make this statement with full regard for the work the committee has done upon this subject. I have great respect for the members of the committee and for its distinguished chairman, Senator GURNEY. It is difficult to assert one's judgment against the judgment of a committee which has worked faithfully upon this matter.

I make my statement also without derogation of the armed forces. I am not in accord with those who are continually derogating our military leaders and the armed services. Like my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], it was my opportunity to serve in the recent war, and I consider it a great honor and my greatest experience to have served. I honor our military leaders, their ability and patriotism, but I assert that it is our responsibility, and not theirs, to determine if there is justification in requiring men to serve in the armed forces for a longer period than the emergency requires.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator agrees, does he not, that the operations of the bill can be ended at any time by the passage of a joint resolution by Congress? Will the Senator further agree with me that it is much easier to pass a joint resolution to stop the operations of the bill—for everyone would joyfully vote for such a joint resolution—than it is to extend its operations? As was so well pointed out by the Senator from California, it has taken us a long time to pass such a bill as is now before us, and it would take us a long time to pass legislation continuing its operations. Does the Senator agree with me that it is much easier to end the operations of the bill than to extend them?

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator, but I do not think his suggestion is an answer to the proposition I am making. My position is that we are embarking upon this program solely because an emergency exists. So far as I am concerned, I do not want today to assume that the emergency must continue, or that conscription must continue, any longer than the emergency actually continues. I think we can with reason say that it will continue at least a year or 2 years. If it lasts longer, the Congress can take the necessary action.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has a very distinguished war record. Does he not agree with me that men cannot be trained overnight, and that time is required to build up trained reserves?

Mr. COOPER. I could spend some time discussing that question upon the basis of my own limited experience. I should say that certainly within a year the reasonable requirements for training could be met. I believe that anyone who has had military experience will support that view.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. With respect to the draft bill which was passed in 1940 when we were preparing for the Second World War, was that for 1 year or 2 years?

Mr. COOPER. I am unable to answer the question of the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was for 1 year. Can the Senator see any reason why this bill should be for longer than 2 years?

Mr. COOPER. I must say frankly that we have more information and experience now than we had in 1940, and it might be argued that our experience in 1940 makes the length of this program necessary. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to vote for peacetime conscription for a period longer than the emergency actually exists.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I express my thanks to the Senator for being able to answer the Senator from Mississippi. The purpose of this bill is completely different from the purpose of the bill passed in 1940. Then we were afraid that we were going to get into a war. We had a very small military force, and we wanted to build it up. Today we have a substantial military force. We need more, but essentially we need trained Reserves to keep our country strong and to keep our word in world councils strong in the next few years. I submit to the Senator from Mississippi that the purposes are completely different from the purposes in connection with the situation in 1940.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate longer. The reasons which have been given by the Senator from Oregon are unanswerable. There is no point in reiterating those reasons. I merely wished to state my own position on the bill, and I have done so.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky two questions. I have a great deal of confidence in his judgment and in the manner in which he approaches a question and studies it through.

My first question is this: What could take place in the world which would eliminate the emergency with which we are now confronted?

The second question is: How long would it take to overcome the emergency which compels us to vote for the draft today? That is the question in my mind, whether we vote for a 2-year period or a 5-year period. If I thought that we could overcome the emergency and settle the crisis in the world in 2 years, I should say that we should not have the draft for more than 2 years. But if more than two years are required to perfect the United Nations organization—and in my opinion that is the only organization which will maintain peace in the world—we might better vote for selective service on the basis of more than 2 years—possibly 5 years.

Those are the two questions which I wish to ask the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend that he has asked me questions which every person in the world would like to have answered. I cannot answer those questions. If the circumstances which obtain at present continue next year, I am certain that the Congress will continue this measure. I

am always hopeful, however, that there may be a change in circumstances, and that the continuance of this measure will not be necessary. Whether that be true or not, I return to my original principle, that I do not believe it is good policy, or that we have the moral right, to continue conscription in peacetime for any period longer than the actual emergency.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I express my gratitude to the Senator from Kentucky for yielding. I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota, in answer to his question—if I may give my answer—that if he will look back into our history, it required 13 years after the close of the Revolution to adopt the Constitution. It required at least 10 years after the distressing Civil War before conditions became anywhere near normal. We all hope and pray that the United Nations will become effective. However, time, patience, courage, and much thought will be required. In the meantime we should be strong.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In reply to the Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that what he has stated is my conviction. I fear that we shall not have accomplished what we hope for in the United Nations within a period of 2 years. I feel that 5 years will be required to perfect the United Nations and incorporate into it the policing power which can maintain peace and order throughout the world. In order to accomplish that objective more than 2 years will be required. For that reason, I shall support the position of the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to support the committee with respect to the 5-year provision in the bill. The 5-year period was not a number which was pulled out of the thin air. In the first place, in drafting the bill we had in mind establishing in the United States what General Bradley called a "realistic readiness," and what Secretary Marshall, paraphrasing the words of George Washington, called "a military posture." It seems to me that any period short of 5 years is utterly inadequate to indicate that we mean business in the establishment of a trained armed force of the necessary number.

In his testimony before the committee Secretary Marshall said this:

The clear-cut issue is whether or not this country will stand before the world for at least the next 5 or 10 years in a position appropriate to its leadership in furthering the perpetuation of free governments and avoiding their transition into police states.

That was the Secretary of State speaking. He ought to know—and I believe he does know—more about the details of the international situation than can anyone who is not as directly concerned with them as he is. He says that we need this "military posture," as he described it, for a period of at least 5 or 10 years, because he envisages the possibility that the unsettled international situation will continue for at least that length of time.

The late war was fought on gigantic proportions. It involved more nations, more peoples of the earth, and more areas than were ever involved in a war before. As we look back on World War I, we know that there was a long period of time before conditions settled down, and before there was a reasonable degree of peace. Then it was a comparatively short time before things were stirred up again. Following World War I we immediately disbanded our Military Establishment. We withdrew our forces from everywhere. We all came home and put our rifles away and immediately attempted to resume normal peacetime living. We tried to forget what had been happening for the 3 years or more we were in the conflict.

As I previously stated, it was a long time before conditions settled down. Following World War I we did practically nothing to maintain our Military Establishment.

In 1923, believing that we had won a world war, we called a Disarmament Conference. We made very earnest and sincere gestures. We went further than gestures. Other peoples made gestures, but we actually put into operation, so far as our Nation was concerned, a disarmament program. Now we are able to witness what can fairly be said to be, in part at least, the result of our policy at that particular time. Therefore, it seems to me, that it is wise to continue the draft, or indicate that we intend to continue it, for a period of at least 5 years. If, in the meantime, the situation improves and conditions quiet down, there will be nothing to prevent the Congress from discontinuing the draft at that time. From our brief experience at this session and at the last one, it is perfectly apparent that the Congress is able to undo things much faster than it can do them; and that is certainly true of legislation of this particular kind.

I agree with what the distinguished Senator from California has said, namely, that if 2 years hence, after a political campaign, we were faced with the problem of continuing the draft, we would in the meantime have drafted men and we would have started to build up our Military Establishment and the Reserves; and then we would find ourselves in the middle of a discussion of whether we should continue it. This is a program which, I think, above almost all others, must be continued on a fairly long-range basis.

I should also like to quote from the testimony of General Eisenhower. There was considerable discussion and testimony before the committee as to whether the United States needs manpower and whether we are approaching an era of so-called push-button war. As I recall, either at that time or on other occasions, in his appearance before our committee, General Eisenhower stated that, with all the talk about push-button war, he thought it might be wise for the people to know that, so far as his knowledge of it was concerned, about all we had with which to conduct a push-button war was a push button and nothing else, and that for a considerable time to come

we need manpower. In referring to the particular question as to whether we need manpower over a period of time, he said:

What the future implications of 10 or 15 years from now will be none of us can tell. But for the moment we do know that any war of the approximate future, 3 to 5 years, will look, to some extent, at least, like it has looked in the late war.

So, Mr. President, we need manpower, not on a 2-year basis but on a 5-year basis, because that proclaims to the people of the world that we mean business; that in taking this step we are going to continue on the same path for a period of 5 years—reserving always, of course, the right of the Congress to discontinue the draft in that period of time.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in view of the international situation we now confront, it is a great deal better to adopt a policy by which we say to the world, "We are ready; we intend to be ready for a substantial time to come in the future. We are making our preparations to cover a period of discontent and unsettlement which we anticipate may be as long as 5 years, unless conditions improve in that time." The question whether during that period conditions will improve must in every instance be left largely to the other fellow, because he is the one who now can make the gestures; he is the one who now can make the moves, if he is thinking of aggression in the next 5 years. Certainly we have made every possible gesture in the direction of peace. Certainly we have manifested in every way our desire for peace and have shown our intentions for peace. But our gestures have not been regarded; our intentions apparently have not been believed.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is only one alternative open to us, and that is a period of realistic readiness until such time as the world generally manifests a desire to be at peace. If that time comes—and God grant that it may come in that period of 5 years—then in the course of an afternoon here in the Congress we could discontinue the draft. It will be a very simple and a very happy thing to do when we are ready for it; but that time has not yet arrived.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall be as brief as possible.

In the first place, I wish to compliment and congratulate the Committee on Armed Services for the very splendid job which has been done in the preparation and presentation of this proposed legislation. When one considers the conflicting interests which have had to be reconciled insofar as it has been possible to reconcile them, and which have had to be faced, and in spite of which this proposed legislation has been produced, one is filled with a great deal of admiration for the accomplishments of that committee. So I pay tribute to the Armed Services Committee.

Naturally, Mr. President, I do not agree with everything that is in this bill. I doubt that any Member of the Senate or for that matter, any Member of the House would agree with everything in this kind of bill. Naturally, I can under-

stand the attitude of those who do not wish to vote for selective service. There is no one in this Chamber, I dare say, who will take any pleasure in voting for this kind of legislation. However, that is not why we are going to vote for it. It is not why I am going to vote for this bill, no matter what its form, when the Senate has disposed of the amendments which now are before us.

I shall vote for the bill, Mr. President, because I believe, as has already been pointed out, that we in the United States must be adequately prepared. This is all a part of an integrated program, as I see it: Selective service; universal military training, if it is to be agreed upon; the 70-group air force; the European recovery program. All of these—our armed forces and our economic efforts—are a part of an integrated program to try to help bring peace to the world.

There is nothing warlike in what we are contemplating here. There is nothing warlike in anything we are attempting to do here. That is not our purpose. Never has it been in our minds. Rather, as I have said before, our objective is peace.

So it seems to me that in the consideration of this particular bill, which deals primarily, as I understand, with selective service, it would be well for us to consider whether this bill is primarily aimed at peace. I know that is the purpose of this bill. From what has been said by those who have spoken previously, I understand that 5 years may be a period which may be required for that purpose. Mr. President, if selective service is as we suppose it to be—merely a stopgap between one condition and another, a present condition which may become much better, and which we prayerfully hope will become much better; and a condition which may become considerably worse, and which we prayerfully hope will not become considerably worse, but will improve—then it seems to me this proposed legislation should be geared accordingly. Consequently, it seems to me that 5 years is too long a time for this proposed law to be in effect, for the law is aimed primarily to fill a gap, to be a stopgap measure and a temporary expedient.

I do not agree with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon, in regard to the suggestion for a 2-year period. I agree, rather, with the distinguished Senator from California. I think 2 years would be a very bad limitation, just as now it is very unfortunate for us to be considering this type of legislation, when we are confronted with a political campaign. This matter should never be a political issue in the United States. This question of preparedness should be something on which all Americans are agreed. To allow it ever to enter into a political campaign as a political issue would seem to me to be most unfortunate. It is not a question primarily of returning to the voters, with an idea of getting the voters' expression. I am sure that every one of our constituents wants us to exercise the best judgment of which we are capable in dealing with this matter; and if we exercise judg-

ment of that type, whether they have an opportunity immediately thereafter to vote insofar as we are concerned and insofar as our return to office is concerned, or have to delay a year or so in voting, should make very little difference. The important thing about the consideration of proposed legislation of this type is that there be an opportunity for its full and complete and ample discussion all during the time it is under consideration.

I very much fear that 2 years hence, just as is true in the present instance, we shall be faced with a situation when there is inadequate time for proper consideration in the two Houses of the Congress. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest to the able Senator from Oregon a compromise between the 2-year point that he proposes and the 5-year point which is in the pending bill—the 5 years, which I feel is too long, and the 2 years, which for reasons I have indicated seem to me to be inappropriate. I would therefore ask him kindly to submit a modifying amendment to change his proposal from 2 years to 3 years, which would fix the termination of selective service at a time when we would not be facing an election, but in a year when it could be given adequate consideration. This would still afford a sufficient length of time, which would seem to me to be altogether appropriate under circumstances which have been cited.

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

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from New York that an adequate national defense should never be a political matter. That prompts me to ask the Senator this question: Should the Senate assume responsibility for saying when an emergency exists and determine when men shall be called to meet it or should the Senate pass that buck to the President?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not think that is a very difficult question to answer. In line with what I have just said, the matter of a national emergency, if there be a true national emergency, rests with all of us, both with the Executive, with the Senate, and with the House. There never should be a time in this country when any one particular branch of the Government, unto itself, and of itself alone, in the face of a real national emergency—and that is what I am talking about—should be left to meet it or to act upon it alone.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am only going to talk for a minute on this amendment, for I feel the ground has been very well covered by other members of the committee. I remember the remark made by the Senator from New York a moment ago, that the military policy of the country should be geared to world conditions. That statement was made I am sure in support of his contention that we cannot look forward 5 years. He has now suggested the amendment be changed to 3 years. Personally, I think the manpower strength of our armed forces should be geared constantly to the world situation. I think the pending measure does that.

I do not think it is necessary to wait 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, or 5 years.

As I said in my opening remarks on the pending bill, each subsequent Congress should look at the world situation and come back to the bill, which is flexible, and set the maximum figures each year for each branch of the service, the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

By examining page 3 of the pending bill it will be found that each service has a maximum strength fixed by Congress. Should the House agree with the idea—and I think they do, as shown by the bill presently on the House Calendar—that is the way to gear it each year to the world situation.

If Congress by joint resolution can fix the maximum strength necessary, in view of world conditions a year from now, or 2 years from now, why not keep the bill in its entirety on the books, looking to each subsequent Congress to accept its responsibility just as this Congress is accepting its responsibility in setting the maximum strength of each branch of the service? That is one point I should like to make.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if he does not consider selective service to be fundamentally something of a very temporary nature in and of itself?

Mr. GURNEY. Absolutely.

Mr. IVES. It is not universal military training, though it might be the beginning of it. Selective service is merely a stopgap; is it not?

Mr. GURNEY. No; it is very necessary in case of an emergency.

Mr. IVES. A stopgap is generally vital. I did not mean it was unnecessary. It is necessary.

Mr. GURNEY. We hope it is a stopgap.

Mr. IVES. That is its real function; is it not?

Mr. GURNEY. We hope it fills the gap. The pending legislation can be simply a stopgap, keeping in mind the possible danger. Each subsequent Congress should look to its responsibility and make it a stopgap for the world situation by adding improvements from year to year.

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

Mr. GURNEY. Let me finish the answer, if I may. I have not yielded. Let us see how it operates. In the first place, there is set for the Army a maximum strength of 790,000. Do we expect to call under selective service 790,000 men between the ages of 19 and 26? The answer is we do not. How do we propose to get them? Some of them are in the service now. There are some who will reenlist. The enlistments of some of them have not yet run out. Others will volunteer.

The best estimates I was given run from 190,000 to about 300,000 who will have to be drafted under the pending measure during the next 12 months. It is not the intention to draft the whole 790,000. Next year, if the situation improves, the maximum would be lowered.

Possibly none would be drafted. But the bill will remain on the books. The volunteer provisions will remain, the training provisions will remain. There will be a building up of the Reserve by reason of the provisions of the pending measure.

The bill, when passed, should remain in effect. If it becomes unnecessary to call more than 300,000 as the maximum strength of the Army, the other provisions should remain, so that the strength would be built up elsewhere, and it would soon be possible to discontinue drafting men at all. That is the purpose of the pending measure, to build up strength elsewhere.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I have one more point. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I would ask the able Senator one question. He pointed out that the pending measure should be reviewed year by year. I gathered that from his remarks. I agree with the Senator that, no matter what is done, it ought to be reviewed year by year by the Congress.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts pointed out in his remarks the fact that by joint resolution we can drop this whole procedure, this whole plan, any time we want to. That is definitely understood.

The fact still remains, does it not—and I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota—that with a 3-year period it would be perfectly practicable to set up the plan and put the program into operation. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. It is also possible under 5 years.

Mr. IVES. Of course, it would be possible under 50 years, too.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. I understand that. I can understand how under 1 year it would not be very practical, but I say it would be practical under 3 years.

Mr. GURNEY. Not quite.

Mr. IVES. Substantially it would be practical to do it that way, would it not?

Mr. GURNEY. No, it would not.

Mr. IVES. I thought the Senator just said it would be.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is pinning me down now.

Mr. IVES. I am trying to.

Mr. GURNEY. I am trying to state why it would not be practical.

Mr. IVES. The Senator may get technical, and I do not want to be technical. For all substantial purposes, it could be limited to 3 years without doing damage to anyone.

Mr. GURNEY. I do not agree with the Senator. I will tell him why. This bill not only gives us strength for the Regular Establishment, through all the methods of reenlistment, volunteering, and selective service, but it also establishes a program for Reserves. If we get started on the program, in 2 years it would be possible that the Congress would not have to appropriate such huge amounts of money as are now necessary for the Military Establishment.

Mr. IVES. I can appreciate that.

The Senator from New York would like to make an observation. I am thinking of another angle in this connection. I

do not know whether the Senator realizes it, but if it is a 5-year proposition with which we finally have to deal, every year, beginning next year, pressure will be applied to have us, by joint resolution, get rid of it. If we have it for 3 years, or even 2 years—I do not like the 2-year idea because of what I said about it—but if it be 3 years, we shall have ample reason to say, "No; it has not gone far enough. We have not had time to see how it will work." I can fully understand what might occur at the end of 3 years, or at the end of 4 years. We might be getting rid of it under pressure. So it seems to me, from every angle from which one wants to look at it, the 3-year proposition is the most sensible.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, while I have been sitting here I have been hearing a great deal about the testimony of experts such as General Bradley and General Eisenhower. It seems to me that some of my Democratic friends have not considered the testimony of a gentleman who testified before the committee. His testimony is at almost complete variance with the testimony of General Bradley and General Eisenhower.

After all, Mr. President, it was only a few years ago that the Democratic Party nominated for the Vice Presidency a man by the name of Henry A. Wallace, and it was only about 3 years ago that he very nearly secured the majority of the votes in the Democratic national convention. If he had received them, he today would be President of the United States. I do not pretend to agree with all the testimony which he gave before the committee, but, certainly, so long as we are hearing from other experts, I think the Senate should consider the testimony of Mr. Wallace, because there may be one chance in a hundred that he is right.

So I want to call to the attention of the Senate some of the testimony of the man whom the Democratic Party nominated and almost renominated for Vice President. His testimony appears on page 542 of the hearings, as follows:

The American people want peace. They want lasting peace achieved through world cooperation in the United Nations. They want a strong and prosperous America.

The American people hate war.

Mr. President, I remember very well reading some of Mr. Wallace's speeches during the war against Hitler. I do not remember hearing any speeches made by anyone that was more warlike than were the speeches which Mr. Wallace delivered upon various occasions some 3 or 4 or 5 years ago. He says:

The American people hate war. Yet step by step they are being taken down the road to war, the country is being progressively weakened, and unless the people reverse this dangerous trend we face national disaster.

The bipartisan foreign policy of the administration assumes that war is inevitable. Remobilization, if authorized by Congress, will set off an international armaments race.

I think no honest man can dispute that statement.

World fears and tensions will increase. Mobilization and countermobilization will lead to world war III.

Mr. Wallace continued:

Our country is in danger. But the danger comes from our own policies which will bring

war—unnecessary war—upon our country. The crisis lies in the war fever itself—not in real threats of invasion but in the synthetic threats of invasion pumped up to support the arms program.

The administration wants us to believe that a world crisis has arisen which threatens our security.

I submit, Mr. President, that certainly Mr. Wallace, in view of the fact that he was head of the Department of Agriculture and head of the Department of Commerce, to both of which positions he was confirmed by the Senate of the United States, must have been a good Cabinet officer. The Democrats in this body said he would make a good Secretary of Commerce. They said he would make a good Secretary of Agriculture. The Democrats all over the Nation, in national convention assembled, said that Henry A. Wallace would make a good President if anything should happen to Franklin D. Roosevelt. At that time they must have trusted him. At that time, when they picked him out of 140,000,000 people, they said to the American people, "He is the man we want for President in case anything happens to Mr. Roosevelt." Certainly, Mr. President, when Mr. Wallace talks about the administration today he speaks as one who was on the inside, a man who attended Cabinet meeting after Cabinet meeting, and who, time and time again, was a close confidential adviser to President Roosevelt.

He said in his testimony:

The administration wants us to believe that a world crisis has arisen which threatens our security. But it has presented no facts to substantiate this.

Then Mr. Wallace said:

I charge an artificial crisis was deliberately manufactured to stampede Congress and the people into accepting universal military training and conscription.

Then, strangely enough, Mr. Wallace quotes the Wall Street Journal as one of his authorities. He says:

On March 19 the Wall Street Journal made a pointed comment on the President's all too frequent declaration of crises.

He quotes the Wall Street Journal as follows:

When these crises are proclaimed, they seem always to call for the speedy enactment of measures which the administration previously has recommended but failed to obtain.

This one calls for resumption of the draft and universal training.

This administration never wanted to give up the draft and it has worked hard to have Congress approve universal training.

That is a quotation from the Wall Street Journal of March 19 last. Mr. Wallace continued:

The administration is again using the "crisis" technique. The objective of this fear campaign is to paralyze the will and mind of the American people so that they will accept the plans to militarize America.

Mr. President, there may be something to what Mr. Wallace says. I am sure I do not know, because I do not profess to be an expert, but one thing is certain, namely, that the 12 leading Protestant denominations of America have met and

almost unanimously have declared against the pending measure.

That is not all. As every Senator knows, leading educators all over the country, some of them the very men who testified in favor of our getting into World War I, and said we had to get into that war, today testify just to the contrary. So, as I have said, there may be something to what Mr. Wallace stated. He proceeded:

The security of the United States is not threatened—except from Washington.

He asked this question before the committee:

Are we threatened by the Soviet Union?

He answered it himself by saying:

That nation lost 10,000,000 lives in the war. The most productive sectors of its economy were destroyed. After 2½ years of reconstruction its production has just regained the prewar level. It will take the Soviet Union many years to attain an industrial output equal to one-half our current production. Meanwhile, if we do not squander our resources in preparations for war, the United States can increase its output by 50 percent in the next decade, raise itself to an undreamed-of prosperity, and help promote the prosperity of the rest of the world.

Mr. President, so long as some Senators are quoting experts, quoting General Bradley, General Eisenhower, and other authorities, it seems to me we should have the benefit of Mr. Wallace's views, whether we agree with him or whether we do not, in view of the fact that he held these many interesting and important positions in the Democratic Party.

Mr. Wallace asked another question:

Does anyone seriously believe that the Soviet Union wants another war? The most ardent advocates of the unsuccessful, 2-year-old, get-tough-with-Russia policy admit that the Soviet Union does not want war. They even concede that the Soviet Union fears war. The single fact is that the Soviet Union cannot attack the United States. As the Wall Street Journal cynically said, if the Russians wanted to attack us, "they would have to swim to get here."

Mr. Wallace further said:

There is no military threat to our national security. The administration has concocted a nonexistent threat to force through unpopular legislation. What is happening today was frankly described by James Reston, correspondent of the New York Times, more than a year ago.

Reston said, March 16, 1947, that the administration believes "the most successful way to introduce foreign policy in Congress is to oversell it piecemeal in an atmosphere of crisis."

This crisis technique subverts the democratic process and leads to the regimentation of thought. It seeks to stifle criticism with fear. Thought control by fear has been described by Dr. A. M. Meerlo of the Inter-Allied Psychological Study Group which functioned in England during the war. He pointed out that:

"Fear paralyzes the human mind, hypnotizes it, as it were, and makes it passive. Hitler always made the Germans believe that they had to defend themselves against alleged encirclement."

Then Mr. Wallace continued:

Today, the technique of fear is directed against Americans. A war hysteria has been

generated so that Americans will accept the militarization of their economy and life.

Mr. Wallace said:

I don't think it will work.

There are too many millions of Americans who are waiting, as I am waiting, for some real proof that our national security is threatened.

Mr. President, I have read this testimony because I became very much interested in the question of universal military training. Nowhere—and I challenge the distinguished Senator in charge of the pending bill—nowhere, from one cover to the other of the volume of the hearings, is there any real proof that the security of America is threatened.

Said Mr. Wallace:

I am waiting for the industrialists and financiers who now profit from these war preparations to say—

Mr. President, what I am going to quote now should be said time and time again. Mr. Wallace said:

I am waiting for the industrialists and financiers who now profit from these war preparations to say—

Before I quote what he said, remember, Mr. President, that in World War II industry went on a strike. Industry said:

We will not produce unless we are guaranteed profits.

But when there was a little labor strike somewhere, there were full-page advertisements saying how unpatriotic labor was. So the record today is replete with the enormous profits industries made out of World War II.

Mr. President, I was the first Senator to rise on this floor and ask that the \$106,000,000,000 of war assets be not wasted, and that a commission be appointed by the President so as to save every single penny we possibly could. What has happened to our \$106,000,000,000 worth of property? As I remember, three men were appointed as a commission, in October. One of them was one of our former colleagues, Senator Gillette, of Iowa. October passed, November passed, December passed, and January came before Mr. Gillette finally, waiting until the expiration of his term as Senator, joined the other two men on the commission.

What happened after Mr. Gillette joined the others? The people of my State wanted to get some of the war material, and they offered to pay every single penny it was worth. In the law creating the War Assets Commission it was provided that the United States Government itself should have the first chance, the first preference, in buying war materials. Next came various States, then the counties, and so on, then the universities. But January, February, and March went by, and finally three Senators went to the office of the War Assets Administration, one the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], another the distinguished Senator Chandler, at that time representing Kentucky in the Senate, and myself.

Three months after January, Mr. President, the rules providing for the

sale of that property still had not been drawn up. That is the sort of administration we had at the hands of the Democratic Party at that time. Then what happened? Two of the members of the Surplus Property Board, one from Rhode Island and one from California, could not get along with the member from Iowa. They quarreled and finally the member from Iowa resigned.

Then Congress passed a new law and placed one man in charge instead of three. A short time thereafter the man in charge resigned. Congress then created a new agency and another man was put in charge of it, and he was in office 5 or 6 months, and, lo and behold, he was promoted, and another vacancy occurred.

In the meantime, what has happened to the \$106,000,000 worth of surplus property? I need not tell the Members of this body what happened to it. The very tractors, the very trucks, the very caterpillars, the very road machinery we wanted was kept from being sold to the people of the country because the big manufacturers, the war profiteers, who are described by Mr. Wallace in his testimony before the committee saw to it that that machinery, which was in foreign lands, was not even returned to the United States of America. In Italy it was sold for 1 cent on the dollar. In other countries it was given away. In a few other countries we said, "Under lease we are giving it to you."

There is much talk today about Russia. Russia herself received nearly \$12,000,000,000 worth of war assets in machinery, planes, and money. I remember when the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the late Senator Scrugham, of Nevada, and I, as a committee went to Alaska. At that time the Government was giving planes to Russia. This ally of ours would not even let the United States fly the planes which were given Russia for nothing, within a thousand miles of Russian territory. Those planes were not delivered at Nome. Nome is 45 or 46 miles away from the coast of Siberia. The Russians said, "You cannot come so close to Siberia. We will come and get the planes at Fairbanks." That is where the planes were delivered to the Russians. When we were discussing the matter with some Russians who came to fly the planes back to Russia, did they say "Thank you" for the planes? They did not. They said, "Harry Hopkins promised us 385 planes a month, and the United States is not delivering that many. Besides," the Russians said, "the planes which are being delivered are much smaller than the planes we thought we were going to receive."

I read again what Mr. Wallace said in his testimony before the committee:

I am waiting for the industrialists and financiers who now profit from these war preparations to say:

"We are patriotic Americans. We are alarmed at threats to our country. For the duration of the crisis we are giving up all profits, all dividends, all huge salaries. Everything above normal living expenses belongs to the Treasury of the United States, and we want the Congress to put this into law until the emergency ends. We refuse to

take a penny of profit for the defense of our country. We stand with the boys who are drafted in making sacrifices for freedom."

Whether we agree with Mr. Wallace or whether we do not, the fact nevertheless remains that hundreds of thousands of our citizens are waiting for these financiers and industrialists to say what Mr. Wallace is waiting for them to say.

Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] said upon the floor of the Senate that we paid \$10,000,000 apiece for 45 ships, and then after the war sold them for \$90,000 apiece. The Senator said something about an investigation. But, Mr. President, what good is an investigation after we have sold the ships and the money has been paid? Who received some of those ships? Some of the very officials who were appointed by the President, who knew where the surplus property was located, resigned, and bought some of it for almost nothing on the dollar. So I say that Mr. Wallace in his testimony before the committee strikes a tender chord when he says he is waiting for some of the industrialists and financiers to say that they are not going to make a single penny out of our preparations for war, the money for which we have been voting.

Mr. Wallace continued:

I am waiting for that proof; and for proof that those who talk of a conscript army to defend freedom actually believe in freedom. I am waiting to hear the Defense Secretary say:

"We are not hypocrites. We really believe in freedom. We are devoted to democratic principles. We are abolishing—utterly and completely abolishing—all discrimination and segregation for reasons of race, creed, or national origin."

Mr. Wallace continued:

But today the cries of danger are suspect. When pressed to reveal what they mean by the threat to national security—

All these fellows who are yelling about preparing for national defense, worrying about national defense—

when pressed to reveal what they mean by the threat to national security, the drum-beaters for militarization bring out another alleged danger—"political aggression." That is described as "Communist infiltration" in Europe and Asia.

Those words are not mine, Mr. President, I am quoting from Mr. Wallace, and I say there is perhaps one chance out of a hundred he is right.

In any event I submit that a man who has been Secretary of Agriculture, appointed to that office by the President and confirmed by the Senate, a man who has been Secretary of Commerce, appointed by the President and confirmed by this body, a man who was selected out of 140,000,000 people by the Democrats of the United States of America in their convention, and elected by the people of the United States at the election to be their Vice President, a man who for 4 years presided over this body—certainly his views are entitled at least to be considered. I do not say I agree with him. But when a Senator a few moments ago read two lines from the testimony of General Bradley and another Senator quoted three or four

lines from General Eisenhower, then certainly this body is entitled to have the views of a man who has held so many important governmental positions.

Mr. Wallace continued:

These phrases confuse the realities of a world in transition. They are every bit as loose in their use of the word "Communist" when they speak of policies abroad as they are when they attack as "Communist" liberal proposals here at home.

I have in my office, and will be glad to show to the distinguished Senator occupying the chair [Mr. CAIN] or to any other Senator, not one, not a dozen, not 20, 30, or 40, but more than 100 letters saying that ROBERT A. TAFT is a Communist and Socialist because he advocated the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Some men who disagreed with him and did not like the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill promptly called the Senator from Ohio a Socialist and a Communist. So, as Mr. Wallace says:

These phrases confuse the realities of a world in transition. They are every bit as loose in their use of the word "Communist" when they speak of policies abroad as they are when they attack as "Communist" liberal proposals here at home. President Truman and the bipartisan supporters of his anti-Communist crusade are saying in effect that American security is threatened by the endeavors of backward countries everywhere to lift themselves from feudalism into the modern world of the twentieth century. Change anywhere in the world is labeled "aggression" by the bipartisans.

Does anyone doubt that statement? Is there any testimony disputing what Mr. Wallace said? Mr. Wallace continued:

Today we are supposed to believe that a democratic election in Italy can be an act of political aggression if the results displease us. But the threat comes only from the free choice of the Italian people—and it is the Italian people whom the militarists fear.

Fear of necessary change cannot halt the progress of mankind. Neither guns nor atom bomb can erase the need for land reform in nations where farms are small and the land is poor.

A few days ago a very distinguished man came over here from Spain. He had been in Italy. I invited the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to meet him. We heard him tell how over in Italy eight families own an entire province. So when Mr. Wallace speaks of land reform, I submit that he is on pretty solid ground.

Mr. Wallace continued:

Radioactive gas will not quench the thirst for knowledge of illiterate peoples. Bacteriological warfare will not halt the drive to modernize and expand industry in undeveloped countries where productivity is low.

The peoples of the world are on the march toward a more abundant life.

I am sure that my Democratic colleagues will all remember the words which were used so often—"again and again and again" by a man who only recently occupied the office of President of the United States. We heard a great deal about the "more abundant life."

Mr. Wallace continued, in his testimony on this bill:

Their struggles for progress are very much like those which marked the development

of our own country. Their aspirations for a better life do not threaten the American people. In fact, the peace and prosperity of the American Nation is tied up with the development of backward countries, with their transition from poverty to plenty. This world-wide movement away from feudalism threatens only the special interests and entrenched privileges of international big business.

Why was it that when our military authorities went into Germany American capitalists did not go among the people and say, "We want you to organize a bank, and we will lend you the money?" I challenge any Senator to name a single South American country into which American capital went and said, "We will lend you the money to establish a bank." After the League of Nations Charter was adopted, we were all going to be sisters and brothers. The people of South America were going to be our sisters and brothers, and we were going to help them. But I defy any Senator to name a single South American country where our industrialists and financiers said to the people, "You have young men and women here who are graduates of some of the best colleges in the United States. There is no question that you can operate banks. We will lend you the money to establish a bank." Did our industrialists and financiers say that to the people of Peru, for example? Instead, what did they do? They established the bank; and they are out to get the last drop of financial blood they can get out of the people of Peru. That is true of every other South American country.

When we went to Europe we did the same thing over there. As our occupation forces went into Germany and other countries, the Chase National Bank of New York City was establishing branch banks. It had an opportunity to expand. There was no purpose on the part of the American administration to let the people of the occupied countries rehabilitate themselves by establishing institutions which they themselves controlled. That has not been the policy. Our policy has been a policy of expansion in all the countries, including especially China, where American industrialists and financiers could expand their sphere of influence and get every single dollar that they possibly could out of those people who, under the League of Nations agreement, were supposed to be our brothers and our sisters.

Mr. Wallace continued:

Their aspirations for a better life do not threaten the American people.

Mr. Wallace further said—and nowhere in his cross-examination by members of the committee who heard him was the statement gainsaid, because I have the record before me:

If we are to compete with communism we had better get on the side of the people.

I submit that that is pretty good doctrine. It is not answered anywhere in this book.

We must practice the democracy we preach. If we do we shall have allies which bribes and arms cannot buy.

The remobilization demanded by the administration is a program which would protect international privilege and add to the

profits of large corporations as they become the major partners in European and international cartels.

Did the members of the committee interrogate Mr. Wallace and dispute his statement? Quite the contrary. What is the record? When Mr. Wallace talks about monopolies and cartels, at least he brings to my recollection the fact that the Sherman antitrust law was passed in 1890. We should read the congressional debates at that time. When in this very room the Sherman antitrust law was passed, it was stated that it would do away with unlawful conspiracies to concentrate wealth in the hands of the few. In the Sherman antitrust law there was a provision that if that act was violated, those who violated it could be sent to jail for a period of 1 year and could be fined \$5,000. I challenge any Member of the Senate to name one person who, from 1890 to the present time, under any Attorney General, has been sent to jail for violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. Perhaps in a moment some Senator will state the name of one such person. There was only one man who was sent to jail in connection with the Sherman Antitrust Act, and that was Eugene Debs. He was sent to jail, not by a jury, but by a judge, who had issued an order which Mr. Debs violated.

Mr. President, at this time I send to the desk an amendment, which, if adopted, I think, will do much good. The amendment provides that on page 65, in line 4, after the word "compensation", there shall be inserted the words "but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital." As thus amended, that portion of the bill will then read:

(d) Fair and just compensation, but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital, shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the wish of the Senator from North Dakota to have the amendment printed and lie on the table?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. President, Mr. Wallace continued as follows:

The remobilization demanded by the administration is a program which would protect international privilege and add to the profits of large corporations as they become the major partners in European and international cartels. The dollars of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys are to be spent in bolstering these interests. While the propagandists mix fear and the language of humanitarianism, we shall be repressing the forward movement of peoples towards enlightenment and well-being.

Mr. President, we cannot get rid of Henry Wallace just by shrugging our shoulders. I am a Republican. Nevertheless, I realize that for 4 years Mr. Wallace presided over this Chamber. He was picked by approximately 26,000,000 voters, according to my recollection, who voted the Democratic ticket at the time when he was elected Vice President of the United States. Before that, he was nominated by Democrats representing

all the United States. They must have thought he was a very good man, or else they would not have nominated him. Later, when he was named Secretary of Commerce, the Democrats were still in control in this Chamber. They knew all about him. Every day they saw him here. They could read in the newspapers what he stood for. After he had been Secretary of Agriculture for a long time and after he had presided here in the Senate for four long years, the Members of this body said he would make a very good Secretary of Commerce, and they endorsed him. He was appointed by the President to be Secretary of Commerce, and the Senate confirmed the appointment.

References have been made to Mr. Marshall, not as a general, but as Secretary of State. He has not had the experience in the office of Secretary of State that Mr. Wallace had as Secretary of Agriculture, later as Secretary of Commerce, and also as Vice President of the United States.

Remember, too, that Mr. Wallace took various trips. Before Mr. Truman even was nominated to be Vice President, the administration sent Mr. Wallace to China; and for six long weeks Henry Wallace was representing President Roosevelt in China, and our Government paid the bill. The Democrats must have believed he was a very good man or else they would not have sent him to China for 6 weeks.

Mr. Wallace continued at the hearings as follows:

The Forrestal-Truman program for the draft and UMT is a program of aggression. The Wall Street Journal recognized this when it said:

"A large army is a first consideration only if you expect to attack and occupy territory."

The legitimate defense needs of our country bear no resemblance to their proposals. American boys and dollars must not be used to support native reactionaries in suppressing the demands of people for change.

The President's demand for conscription and compulsory military training carries the Truman doctrine to a new stage—military action. In its first stage, the Truman doctrine was described as a diplomatic effort to "contain" the Soviet Union. The European recovery program was the second stage—economic warfare to implement diplomacy. According to the Journal of Commerce, March 18, 1948, ERP will now be used in large part to ship munitions.

In its third stage the Truman doctrine calls for the application of military force. In the words of the Wall Street Journal, "the progression of this doctrine has been relentless. Its progression, indeed, was inevitable once the Government accepted its basic principles." That principle is that war is inevitable.

War today is total. The whole economy must be militarized to support the war machine. Military conscription must therefore be followed by labor conscription.

I call attention to the fact that here we have a great Democrat speaking, the man who for a long time was Secretary of Agriculture in a Democratic administration, who for 4 years, as a Democrat, presided over this body, the man whom the Democratic majority in this body thereafter confirmed as Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, he was one of the precious jewels when it came to the campaigns. He was the man whom the Democrats sent all over the great Northwest to tell the people how he had saved the farming industry of the United States. The Democrats were proud of him. Wherever he went he was winned and dined, second only to President Roosevelt himself. It was Mr. Wallace who carried the ticket to victory—as the Democrats said, “to glorious victory.” I maintain today that although there may be only one chance in a hundred of his being right, at least this body is entitled to his views. Mr. Wallace continued:

Civilian consumption must be subordinated to the production of weapons of destruction. The economics of aggression dictate the following progression. Butter and guns are followed by guns and butter and finally by guns and dry bread. While the people tighten their belts, the huge corporations profit on war orders.

Mr. President, I have before me a number of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to certain speeches made upon this floor, speeches which I believe are very germane to the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon and germane to the bill itself.

On Monday, May 10, 1948, Representative VAN ZANDT spoke on the subject, “Veterans of Foreign Wars support H. R. 6258, a bill to take the profits out of war.” Aside from the very small minority of men in this country who own or who are interested in large industrial corporations, the people are overwhelmingly in favor of taking the profits out of war. Mr. VAN ZANDT said:

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H. R. 6258 on April 15, in a statement I mentioned that it was designed to take the profits out of war.

That was similar to my amendment which I sent to the desk a moment ago, which provides that anybody dealing under the program for which we are voting shall not make more than 10 percent profit. I submit that 10 percent profit is enough.

Mr. VAN ZANDT continued:

I also stated that the provisions of the bill were similar to a bill introduced by me in the Seventy-sixth Congress, and which was identical to a bill introduced at that time by 50 Members of the Senate and by 11 Members of the House.

Today, Mr. President, I am almost if not entirely alone. A short time ago the same bill was introduced by 50 Senators. It got exactly nowhere.

Mr. VAN ZANDT continued:

The sponsor of this legislation in the Seventy-sixth Congress was the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I am pleased to report that the VFW is supporting House Resolution 6258 in the Eightieth Congress, as evidenced by the following statement issued by the department of public relations of the VFW to all posts of that organization.

Before asking unanimous consent to have the statement placed in the RECORD, I shall read a few paragraphs. They show what the soldiers think about the way the Congress is running the Government. This is what they think of Senators who are receiving \$15,000 a

year. The statement is so good I believe I shall read it all, because it represents the feeling of hundreds of thousands of soldiers.

The soldier boys were asked to go out and sacrifice their lives. I went to Walter Reed Hospital, where I saw veterans, some without arms, some without legs, some without sight. Yet at that very time the corporations had taken in hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars. Listen to what the Veterans of Foreign Wars have to say:

Speaking in terms of money alone, World War II cost the American taxpayers in expenditures and pyramided debts, in excess of \$330,000,000,000. This figure is five times the total national income during 1939, the year in which the war began in Europe.

During the period 1941 to 1943, inclusive, corporation net profits alone increased more than 100 percent over the preceding 3-year period during which there was little preparation for and no prosecution of a war. The vast bulk of this tremendous increase represents excessive war profits.

There was another kind of debt incurred during the war which cannot be repaid. That debt is owed to the one-third of a million Americans who gave their lives and to the million others who became casualties. The resultant grief of the survivors and disrupted lives of those who served cannot be compensated for in dollars.

Such figures as these tell a simple, yet highly indicative story. In their essence they mean that for some—a small minority we like to think—war is a highly profitable venture, and therefore a desirable one. For others it means sacrifices far above and beyond any monetary value.

Were I to advocate that taking the profits out of war is the sole remedy needed to abolish it I should defeat my purpose in talking to you today (tonight). Obviously it is not. Yet it is an irrefutable fact that most wars in recorded history have been fought purely for selfish, material gains. Whether openly mercenary or under the cloak of an ideology, the profit motive invariably exists to some extent in all wars. I repeat that taking profits out of war will not guarantee its abolition, but I emphasize strongly that it would be one of the greatest deterrents to war yet devised.

With these profits outlawed, any future war in which America might become engaged will truly be a war of purpose—a war fought solely for the preservation of the American way of life.

Constitutionally, the Federal Government cannot confiscate privately owned property to aid in the prosecution of a war in which it is involved. It may, however, appropriate human lives by use of the military draft and use them to the fullest extent if necessary to bring about a successful termination of a war.

Do we see, Mr. President, what these soldiers see, that under our Constitution we cannot confiscate property, but we can confiscate the lives of the young men? Oh, Mr. President, property is inviolate. But we can take the last son in a family of four or five or six and leave a farmer and his wife—I read the record on that question fully last year—with no one to help them. The Army took the last boy from a farmer who was 70 years of age and whose wife was approximately 67 years of age, and left them without any help on the farm. I called attention to another instance in which two sons had been killed, and I learned that the third boy was being sent across the water. It was only after getting in touch with the late Senator David I. Walsh that we

were able to keep that boy from going overseas. He was finally stationed in California.

Under our Constitution we cannot confiscate property. We cannot say to some millionaire or some billionaire, “Now we will take all above five or six or twenty or twenty-five million dollars,” but we can take the lives of young men, and do it constitutionally. These young men see the situation, Mr. President. They brought it to the attention of Representative VAN ZANDT of Pennsylvania.

Manifestly this is essential in times of emergency. But it is no less essential, no less democratic to appropriate excessive profits of war for the common defense. The most iniquitous quality invested in man during time of war is that he should profit from the blood of others. It is totally against the precepts of Christianity.

Maybe that is the reason why the 12 leading Protestant churches in America have come out against the bill which we are today considering.

The one democratic way of utilizing the full productivity of property in time of war without actual confiscation is through a steeply graduated personal and corporation war-profits tax. Thus would be abolished all monetary incentive for war; and those who foster it for its profits would be less belligerent knowing that they stood to lose by it. Those excessive profits which would otherwise go into the pockets of the individual or corporation would, under such an arrangement, revert to the United States Treasury to be used in defraying the expense of the war, with a postwar debt held at a minimum by an excess-profits tax operative during hostilities, there would be created a salubrious condition for a stabilized postwar economy. What war debts might be incurred could quickly be liquidated thus sparing a burden for succeeding generations to shoulder. Of no little consequence is that excess-profits taxes during war would do much to avert years of economic depression and widespread unemployment which follow in the wake of war and the disruption of world markets.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars continue in their statement as follows:

The drafting of excessive income of individuals and corporations during war would cause all Americans to realize that any future war would result not only in the loss of human life and misery to millions of citizens, but it would also mean the sacrifice of all profits above living expenses. The burdens of war would then be more equally distributed. To certain extents we would all be in it together—not just those who do the actual fighting. Potential profiteers of any possible future war, realizing that net profits, after payment of war taxes, would be less during time of war than during time of peace, would very probably be instilled with a strong desire for a policy by our country of doing all possible to stay out of war. With war profits gone, we should have to have an impeccably moral and worthy cause before entering another war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place the remainder of this statement in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Is there objection?

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

For many years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has urged upon Congress the enact-

ment of legislation outlawing discriminatory war profits. Under its auspices such a bill was introduced into Congress on Americanization Day, April 27, 1938, along with the signed endorsement of 4,000,000 American citizens. Similar bills under VFW sponsorship were presented the following year under joint authorship of 50 Senators and 4 Representatives. These bills clearly had the backing of the American people. However, opposition and criticism of the bills by those who would be most affected by it prevailed, and shortly thereafter we entered World War II. As a result, fabulous personal and corporate fortunes were made just as they were made in World War I, and our war debt went up into astronomical figures. And so even after the war, the little man, the man who endured the rigors of war at \$60 a month, the man who lost his son on Iwo Jima or at St. Lo, must keep on paying and paying. Those who stayed at home to reap the harvest will pay too—but how well they can afford it.

Today, hostile acts and aggressive tactics abroad are again threatening to embroil us in another and even more devastating global conflict. It is not my purpose today (tonight) to dwell upon the present international situation, or to offer solutions to the grave problems confronting us. I do wish to emphasize, however, the urgency of considering now a strong restraining influence on those who would compromise our national security by the greed for profits by which they are dominated—even at the expense of human life and abject misery.

To prevent, in the event of a future war, a repetition of the creation of war-made millionaires, the Veterans of Foreign Wars is again sponsoring a bill designed to eliminate those ill-gotten gains by steeply graduated income and other taxes during hostilities. This is House Resolution 6258 introduced on April 15, 1948. Its provisions will equalize the financial costs of war and provide for an effective defense at a time when it is most needed. It will do all possible to insure peace, but in case of attack by a foreign power, it will direct the entire resources of the Nation impartially toward the war's speedy and successful conclusion.

It must be understood clearly that H. R. 6258 is in strict conformance with our present tax laws and violates no constitutional provisions. It is applicable only in time of war and ceases when Congress declares war to be at an end. It makes no attempt to confiscate property nor does it violate the individual rights of any citizen. It bestows no unusual powers upon any one individual. It establishes no vast political machine, for it operates, when effective, with our existing tax-collecting agencies. Its provisions have been studied and approved by the country's leading tax experts. Its enactment would do more to prevent a world catastrophe than any other statute now in effect. It is written to aid the common man who is always the big loser in any war. It is the epitaph of the war profiteer.

One of the principal objections that has been voiced against this proposed measure (and you may be sure that those who stand to profit by war are the most vociferous against it) is that it is not in line with the principles of American democracy, and that it smacks of communism and socialism. I maintain that such an accusation is absurd in the face of those very principles upon which our democracy operates. If 100 percent of the bodies and minds of our finest young men are democratically drafted for national defense, it would be utter stupidity to assert that the wealth represented in the form of dollars which these same men helped to create is exempt from doing its part in the preservation of the system by which it came into being. In time of war our people fight, and often die for the continuation of the American form of government. Is it fitting then that huge individual and cor-

porate war profits stand idle and later become a burden upon those who fight?

I do not maintain that H. R. 6258 would or could equalize all the sacrifices necessary to successfully wage a war if forced upon us. But it most assuredly will bring about a financial equalization, and will minimize to an extent hitherto unknown the sufferings that go with war. It would be a major factor in securing the earliest possible termination of war. Certainly it would spare the burden of huge war debts such as we now have. No legislation alone cannot compensate those who bear the brunt of battle. They have ever been on the short end—their sacrifices cannot be equalled. H. R. 6258 is, however, the nearest thing yet devised to equally distribute the total costs of war. Under its provisions every person not in uniform, and every company and corporation would contribute any excess wartime profits to the financing of a war while it is still in progress. On the basis of actual income, every citizen and every business firm would pay their proportionate shares of the expense of war. With this bill made into law, there will be no more wartime profiteers in the United States.

It is generally accepted that America is a Nation that abhors war and holds to the tenets of peace. Our potential enemies today realize this fact and have, and will in the future, exploit it fully to gain their own ends. It is unfortunate and ignominious that we have in this country certain groups and individuals who play along with these adversaries of freedom. These people would risk not only American security and human lives in another calamitous conflict, but even their own properties for an upsurge in profits from war. Such is their greed—such is their lack of foresight.

This Nation is now in one of the most crucial periods in its history. International tension will probably increase before it can abate. To resist the hue and cry of the forces leading to war will require a fortitude of the utmost degree. Let us not be misled by the wartime promises of a fool's gold which in the end can benefit only the few and bring but sorrow, privation, and despondency to the many. We must guard against propaganda for war by all those who would profit from it. But more than that, we must take all excess profit away from war—and then that propaganda will cease.

I call upon every person with a conscience to support H. R. 6258 and to make his support known to those who will be responsible for its enactment. Surely no person with a sincere belief in the justice of mankind can defend the wartime profiteer. No man with honor can conscientiously oppose a plan which guarantees equal division of the financial burdens of war. No American, worthy of the name, can condone the usury of the few imposed upon the blood of his fellow men.

I leave you with this thought: To help prevent war, let us have no fear of it and be ready for it should it come. If it must come—let it be untainted with the lust for profit. Let it be for the common cause of freedom.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a short time ago there was a very distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable Hugh B. Mitchell, former Senator of the United States, representing the State of Washington—

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me how long he expects to speak?

Mr. LANGER. I do not think it will be very long; possibly an hour. I want to discuss the question of war profits.

Mr. LUCAS. Far be it from me to try to stop the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I will guarantee that my speech will require an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois that 1 hour, so far as the Senator from North Dakota is concerned, is normally a good hour.

Mr. LANGER. Let us call it a senatorial hour, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to know whether the Senator's hour is a daylight-saving hour, or just a normal hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot answer that question.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the suggestion has been made to me that the Senator from North Dakota might yield long enough for a vote on the pending amendment. I have no objection to the Senator from North Dakota keeping the floor. I think he has a message he desires to give to the Senate, and it would not help us particularly to have a vote on the pending amendment, if another one is to be presented. The Senator might as well continue his remarks at the present time, as far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Dakota how long he expects the Senate to remain in session today?

Mr. GURNEY. I am told by the acting majority leader that he would like to have the Senate continue in session until 10:30 or 11 o'clock, or later. He wants to get along with the bill tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope it will not be much later than 11:30.

Mr. GURNEY. I share the hope of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, up until a short time ago there was included in the membership of this body one of the finest men in Washington, Mr. Hugh B. Mitchell. As Senator, he was a member of the Truman committee.

On Friday, August 2, 1946, Senator Mitchell had inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Investigation of War Profits." The article is so good, so clear, so concise, that I wish to read certain portions of it.

Senator Mitchell said:

Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 31, I made certain observations in the Senate with regard to the current investigation of war profits by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. It was my intention to evaluate the committee's findings in the broader context of wartime developments which point an ominous sign toward the future. In the few remaining hours of this session I do not wish to take up any more time, and accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have additional remarks on the same subject printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This is the statement of Senator Mitchell, as printed in the RECORD:

Mr. President, for the past several weeks the American people have heard and read the fantastic story of the Erie Basin case as developed in the hearings of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

The committee's investigation has laid bare in detail the efforts of persons associated with this munitions combine to secure special favors from the Government and to

extract unusual and illegitimate gains from the war. The responses of certain military and other Government officials to these solicitations indicate callous disregard or shocking ignorance of the standards of conduct implicit in public office.

WITNESSES DISAPPEAR

The committee has pursued the facts in this complex case despite difficulties and instances of noncooperation. Some witnesses have rendered themselves inaccessible or unwilling to give testimony. Prior to the hearings, shameful attempts at bribery were made in the vain hope that the committee would be dissuaded from continuing its investigation.

The present inquiry with regard to war profiteering is not unique in the committee's work. Its hearings and reports contain other cases, some less sensational and less involved, but no less indicative of the committee's purpose to insure the honest and efficient disbursement of public funds in behalf of the war effort and to promote the maximum of war production.

Throughout its many and varied investigations into the defense and war programs, the committee has shown a persistent and scrupulous desire to get at the facts. It has never indulged in witch hunts, indiscriminate criticism, and character assassination. It has held itself aloof from partisan considerations and has refused absolutely to lend itself to devious political pursuits. The committee's reports to the Senate record the unanimous judgment of its members.

UNDERLYING SIGNIFICANCE

Mr. President, speaking for myself, I wish to point out the underlying significance of the Erie Basin investigation which may have been obscured by the intense interest in the particulars of the case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of this article, on pages A4770 and A4771, volume 92, part 12, of the Appendix of the RECORD, be printed as a part of my remarks, down to the headline "Favoritism cost billions."

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

Certain persons associated with this dubious enterprise were lacking in tact and judgment; others were downright dishonest. But the startling thing about their combined efforts to obtain special favors from the Government is the success which attended these efforts. To my way of thinking, the facts disclosed in this case cannot be cut loose from the environment in which they transpired. They are but small ugly symptoms of a process of moral degeneration in the dealings of business and government.

Mr. President, the exertion of undue and improper business influence upon government is not something new in American history. There have been many times past when the existence of free, democratic government was threatened by the attempts of influential persons, backed up by the power of associated wealth, to subvert government to the purpose of a privileged few. And always at a critical stage, when political democracy was endangered by economic oligarchy, the people rose up in their wrath and repudiated the agents of special privilege.

SELF-SEEKING LOBBYISTS

America is in grave danger today. Greedy, self-seeking interests hold sway in the land. They send their agents to penetrate high places in Government and to haunt the Halls of Congress. We cannot legislate price control for a few short months without slacking their thirst for large and inordinate profits. We cannot promote housing for veterans and others desperately needing shelter without making special concessions to speculators and

profiteers. We cannot legislate for the promotion of scientific research and the control of atomic energy while the fate of the world hangs in the balance, unless we defer to the wishes of giant corporations. Other legislation vital to the health and security and happiness of the American people dies aborning, because it does not fit into the program of the higher echelons in the business community. And while the hopes and aspirations of the American people for a better life in the aftermath of a terrible war lie still-born, the assorted lobbyists and representatives of greed howl gleefully.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that the line between private interest and public duty has become so jagged and confused? Shall we hold up our hands in horror when we find public officials trading small favors with outside business interests and yielding to their blandishments, without recognizing that the great principle of democratic government is at stake? The strivings of the Erie Basin interests for special treatment pale into insignificance beside the efforts of vested business interests to exploit the instrument of government and gain a stranglehold on the economic resources of this country.

TOO MUCH MONOPOLY POWER

The monopoly power of great corporations has been increased and extended during the war. Available studies show that economic concentration has been hastened by wartime production and the addition of the tremendous wartime plant capacity. Billions upon billions of public funds were channeled into the hands of a few giant corporations by the military procurement officers, and the war agencies directed the flow of manpower and materials to service these colossal procurement contracts.

Mr. President, the corporations that were favored in contract award did not come knocking on the doors of the war agencies to cultivate "contracts" and gain special favors with gifts and bribes. The representatives of these corporations were themselves on the "inside"; they sat high in the councils of the war agencies and marshaled the economic resources of this country for war in accordance with the business preferences of their employers.

TRUMAN DOLLAR-A-YEAR-MEN REPORT

I call the attention of the Senate to the committee's Report No. 480, part 5, which was submitted under Mr. Truman's direction in the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It is stated therein:

"The principal positions of the Office of Production Management were assigned to persons holding important positions with large companies who were willing and anxious to serve on a dollar per year, or without compensation (w. o. c.) basis. They usually did not sever their business connections, but instead obtained leave of absence. Their companies continued to pay their salaries. In some cases their compensation was even increased."

Of course, these men did not pass immediately upon contracts to their companies, but the advantages that accrued were substantial. The committee report continues:

"Although the contracts obtained by the companies loaning the services of dollar-a-year and without-compensation men are not passed upon by the men so loaned, such companies do obtain very substantial benefits from the practice. The dollar-a-year and without-compensation men so loaned spend a considerable portion of their time during office hours in familiarizing themselves with the defense program. They are, therefore, in a much better position than the ordinary man in the street to know what type of contracts the Government is about to let and how their companies may best proceed to obtain consideration. They also are in an excellent position to know what shortages are imminent and to advise their companies on how best to proceed, either to build up

inventories against future shortages, or to apply for early consideration for priorities. They can even advise them as to how to phrase their requests for priorities. In addition, such men are frequently close personal friends and social intimates of the dollar-a-year and without-compensation men who do pass upon the contracts in which their companies are interested.

"These are only a few of the advantages which large companies have obtained from the practice and it should be especially noted that they are the very same ones which the small and intermediate businessmen attempt to obtain by hiring people who they believe have inside information and friends on the inside who could assist them in obtaining favorable consideration for contracts. Therefore, in a very real sense the dollar-a-year and without-compensation men can be termed lobbyists. This does not mean that either they or their companies are engaged in any illegal conduct, for lobbying as such is not illegal, but it does mean that human nature being what it is, there is a very real opportunity for the favoritism and other abuses which has led the public to condemn lobbying and the Congress to consider corrective legislation."

Other less tangible but perhaps more important benefits accruing to companies that sent dollar-a-year men into the Government were implicit in the fact that—

"All important procurement contracts must be approved by these dollar-a-year and without-compensation men, which means that contracts must conform to their theories of business. Since they represent the largest companies, this means that the defense program in all its ramifications must obtain the approval of the large companies."

The type of business thinking which directed the war program was described by the committee as follows:

"It is only natural that such men should believe that only companies of the size and type with which they were associated have the ability to perform defense contracts; that small and intermediate companies ought not to be given prime contracts; that the urgencies of the defense program are such that they have no time to consider small companies for defense contracts; that the large companies ought not to be required to subcontract items which they could profitably manufacture and as to which they express lack of confidence in the productive facilities of smaller concerns; that the producers of strategic materials should not be expected or required to increase their capacities, even at Government expense, where that might result in excess capacity after the war and adversely affect their postwar profits; and that large companies should not be expected or required to convert their facilities into defense plants where they prefer to use their plants to make the profits from their civilian business and, at the same time, to have additional plants directly or indirectly paid for by the Government, which they can operate profitably on terms dictated by themselves. The dollar-a-year and without-compensation men subconsciously reflect the opinions and conclusions which they formerly reached as managers of large interests with respect to Government competition, with respect to taxation and amortization, with respect to the financing of new plant expansion and with respect to the margin of profit which should be allowed on war contracts."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I read further from the statement of Senator Mitchell:

FAVORITISM COST BILLIONS

The Comptroller General of the United States recently appeared before the Mead committee and described how the huge war contracts were renegotiated and terminated. He testified that untold millions, if not billions, of dollars were irretrievably lost to the

Government through inefficiency, ineptitude, and favoritism displayed by contracting officers. Many of these officers were socially intimate with executives of interested companies, and in some cases landed high-paying jobs as a reward for their generous settlement of contracts. The chairman of the committee referred to this simultaneous process of terminating contracts and terminating Government employment as a sort of reconversion back to private industry of these so-called dollar-a-year men and others. Most of the procurement officers wore military uniforms.

Mr. President, we have heard our distinguished colleagues today tell about General Bradley and General Eisenhower and their testimony, but I submit that General Marshall's testimony is given as Secretary of State, not as a general. He was a general at the very time when the Mead committee made this report that billions of dollars were taken—by whom? By men wearing the military uniform. I do not criticize General Marshall for that. I mention it only for the purpose of making clear to the many Senators who are now upon the floor what I said yesterday, or the day before, with respect to who now runs the United States. I then quoted a military magazine, the Army and Navy Bulletin, which in its issue of the 18th of January asked, "Who is running the Government?" and answered its own question by saying, "Why, the Army."

NOMINATION OF THOMAS C. BUCHANAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a short time in order that I may make a statement for the Record?

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut if I do not lose the floor by doing so. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Connecticut without losing the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, under date of June 3 I addressed a letter to our colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, considering the nomination of one Thomas C. Buchanan to be a member of the Federal Power Commission. I wrote to the Senator from Indiana as follows:

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I enclose herewith a transcript of newspaper stories carried in the Philadelphia Record under date of August 3 and 9, 1932, bearing upon the past activities of one A. B. Millar, secretary of the Pennsylvania Electric Association.

A preliminary check-up indicates that there is justification in fact for the stories. In view of the fact that Millar has testified against the nomination of Thomas C. Buchanan to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, it is of vital interest to the people of the United States to know all the facts and I therefore strongly urge that under the authority granted to the subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be a member, you immediately summon Millar to a meeting of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

BRIEN McMAHON.

The story is from the Philadelphia Record of August 3, 1932. I read from it as follows:

HARRISBURG, August 2.—Chairman W. D. B. Ainey, center of Governor Pinchot's latest and heaviest attack on the Pennsylvania Public Service Commission, hoisted the white flag in surrender today. He resigned as the senate prepared to investigate charges of graft lodged against him. The resignation was accepted immediately by the senate and the commission was left with four working members, only two of whom have been confirmed by the senate.

I shall not read all of the story, but after skipping several paragraphs, I read as follows:

A senate investigating committee conducted an inquiry which developed the fact that Ainey and A. B. Millar, a former Mitten employee had gone to Europe on the same boat several years ago.

The investigation was about to be dropped when Governor Pinchot submitted additional sensational charges. These tended to show that Ainey went on the European trip as the guest of Millar and that a hospital bill in Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, was paid for him by the late A. W. Thompson, Pittsburgh utility magnate.

Chapman said money charged to legal expense was given to A. B. Millar, former PRT and Mitten management employee, by Mitten and that it was Chapman's understanding Millar took the money to Ainey at Harrisburg. Ainey denied this. Millar, an official of the Pennsylvania Electric Association with offices in Harrisburg, said he had either cashed these checks and returned the money to Mitten or endorsed the checks and returned the money to Mitten. He said that he did not get any of the money, denied ever giving any to Ainey and claimed ignorance regarding the ultimate destination or purpose of the money.

Millar admitted accompanying Ainey to Europe in 1927, but denied he had paid for Ainey's transportation. The Governor's new evidence included copies of the Cunard Steamship Co. books and records, showing that Millar purchased transportation for a party of five which included, in addition to himself, his wife, daughter, Ainey, and Ainey's attendant.

Mr. President, with one word I shall desist and permit the Senator from North Dakota to proceed. The nomination of Mr. Buchanan has been in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for about 2 months. In the hearings which were held we discovered that the utilities of Pennsylvania had a front man named Dunlap, whom they sent here to testify against Buchanan, which he did not do very successfully. On cross-examination of Dunlap we found that before he came here he talked to A. B. Millar, who is secretary of the Pennsylvania Association of Utilities. So Millar appeared and under cross-examination indicated that his sole duty was to promote the sale of electricity, and the general benefit of the electric-light companies in Pennsylvania; and, perish the thought that he ever engaged in any lobbying, or that he had indulged in any conspiracy with Dunlap in order to frustrate Buchanan's appointment.

In view of this story which appeared in the newspaper, which did not come into the possession of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], a member of the committee, until after the hearings closed, it seemed to some of us, more particularly the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania and myself—although perhaps I should speak only for myself—it seemed to me that it would be a good thing if we called Brother Millar back again and give him another going over, because it looks to me as though the cat is out of the bag, that Millar has been engaged in this kind of business for a long while, and if Buchanan's appointment is going to be blocked by the power interests, I think the people of the United States should know it.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. I have talked with the Senator from North Dakota, and have asked him to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I promised the Senator from North Dakota that I would do my utmost to see that he is recognized after the conclusion of a vote on the pending amendment. It is my purpose at this time, therefore, to suggest the absence of a quorum, and I hope that the Senate will then proceed to a vote, and I further hope that when the vote has been taken the Senator from North Dakota will be recognized and may proceed with his remarks.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that after the vote on the pending amendment the Senator from North Dakota be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none. The request is granted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Hayden	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Capehart	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Langer	Smith
Cooper	Lodge	Sparkman
Cordon	Lucas	Stennis
Donnell	McCarthy	Stewart
Dworshak	McClellan	Taft
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eaton	McGrath	Thye
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Malone	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Watkins
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "G" offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer a modifying amendment, which would change the word "second" to the word "third" in line 2 of the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 2 of the so-called Morse amendment, after the word "thereof", it is proposed to strike out "second" and insert "third."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the way the bill stands at present is the way it is recommended by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. It is our firm conclusion that the best results in keeping the peace will come by showing a firm resolve that we mean to keep this country strong. We can mean to keep it strong for 6 months or for 1 year or for 2 years, 3 years, or 5 years.

When I presented the bill for the committee, I said that the bill is flexible. It can be made flexible within the 5-year period, as set forth in the bill, by having each subsequent Congress take a look at the world situation, determine what is best, and then fix the maximum number of men in each of the three branches of the armed services.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, what the Senator says about keeping the country strong in its armed forces appeals to everyone, not only for a 1-year period or for 2 years or 5 years, but always. But it seems to me that the people of this country have been told—and I know that the Members of the Senate have been told over and over again—that this peacetime draft is a temporary measure necessary to meet the temporary exigency which has arisen in the armed forces.

Now the plan as unfolded to us is that instead of being temporary, for the 2-year period for which the men will be drafted, it will continue; the bill visualizes the carrying on of this draft for a 5-year period.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield the floor to the Senator from West Virginia as soon as I have finished my remarks. If he has a question to put to me, I shall be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator believe that a 5-year period goes beyond the word "temporary," as stated?

Mr. GURNEY. No; I do not; and in the statement I have made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon I have given my reasons for taking that position. I have said that the bill is flexible. I have said that in the bill we have shown a firm resolve to keep the peace, and that the bill is flexible in that connection. If, a year or 2 years from now, we wish to reduce the maximum number of men, in

light of world conditions or events at that time, we can do so as to each of the three branches of the armed services. If we do that, then undoubtedly volunteers will come into the armed services in sufficient numbers so that it will not be necessary to continue to draft anyone. In the meantime, we shall be building up the strength of the reserves and also the strength of the armed forces elsewhere, and therefore we shall provide another chance to cut down the strength of the armed forces—which will cost, for upkeep, close to \$15,000,000,000 a year. That is another purpose of this bill.

Another purpose in having the bill provide for a term of 5 years is that when we come to the conclusion of that period, we can ask, "What can we expect in the near future? Can we expect that the United Nations will be strong enough to maintain world peace in a few years time? Can we expect in a few years to have conditions in Germany, Japan, and elsewhere such that we no longer shall be called upon to keep so many of our armed forces on duty in the occupation zones? Is it right for us to keep these men in the occupied zones, without having in the United States trained reserves to back them up?"

Mr. President, our committee has answered those questions by saying that it is the proper thing to build up the reserves. We say that if we are going to keep certain numbers of our men overseas, in vulnerable positions, we should be ready to back them up.

Therefore, I say the bill is flexible, and it is not necessary to provide a 2-year limitation. We wish to show a firm resolve, and we wish to do everything possible to maintain the peace.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that the sum and substance of the issue now before the Senate is that if the bill passes without this amendment, under the bill the Army will be authorized for a period of 5 years to draft at its own command.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if the Congress did not accept its responsibility each year to reevaluate the situation, then the answer to the Senator's question would be "Yes, absolutely." But I suspect that each subsequent Congress will be very much alive to the situation. Certainly if I am in the Congress, I shall want to reevaluate the situation, and I know the Senator from West Virginia will wish to do so, and I am sure there are about 94 other Senators who will also wish to be very sure that the Congress does not continuously, each year, authorize the armed services to have more than the correct number of men necessary to take care of the situation then confronting the country.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To put it in another way, the Senator speaks of having the Congress reevaluate the situation under the draft each year. The Senator means, I assume, that Congress will have to repeal this law if it decides that it

wants to discontinue the draft within the next 5 years.

Mr. GURNEY. No. I very sincerely tried to tell the Senator the way to proceed in that case. The way in which the bill is flexible—and if the Senator will read the provision on page 3, which is very short, he will see what we have provided—is that it provides a means of reducing the number of men authorized for each branch of the armed services. That point is very clear, I think. The Senator from West Virginia knows that if the world situations improved, and if we were able to cut down the number of men in the armed services to, let us say, 1,200,000, probably we could get along without drafting anyone.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would not it really be wiser and better to meet that situation as it confronts us, instead of today taking the unusual step of creating a draft, not only for this year but over a course of 5-years, although in order to prevent the enforcement of the draft next year and in the years to come for 5 years, the Senate must take action each year to prevent the armed services from continuing the draft?

So it seems to me the whole question is whether we shall act for a 2-year period or a 5-year period and shall authorize the continuation of the draft for 5 years.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the committee was of the firm belief that in order to get the best out of this bill we should show our firm resolve by passing a bill that will be in effect for a length of time sufficient to really take care of the present world situation.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In addition to what the Senator from South Dakota has said, the entire principle behind the bill is to provide inducements to men to volunteer into the services and to undertake training. Under the bill, the Army will have no discretion in the matter of drafting men, although the Senator from West Virginia has seemed to imply to the contrary. We wish to keep the armed forces up to the authorized strength, but we hope to do so by means of volunteers. If this bill is enacted and remains in force, unless Congress in its discretion repeals it, I believe that more and more volunteers will enter the armed services, and this bill will be used less and less.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am very anxious to reach a vote on this amendment. Certainly, a 3-year period is better than a 2-year period; but certainly a 5-year period is, by the same token, better than a 3-year period.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask the Senator to yield to me to permit me to reply very briefly to the statement of the able Senator from Massachusetts that the bill is one to induce volunteers.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts earnestly believe that if the Army has the power to draft men into enforced service it will pay any attention to volunteers or to advocating any volunteer system or to encouraging volunteering?

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply say that under the bill as presently written 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds can volunteer. Today they are volunteering. Under the bill the inducements to enter the National Guard and the Reserves are such that I believe many men will volunteer. I hope a sufficient number will volunteer so as to make less and less necessary this draft provision.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that as I see this bill the only inducement to volunteering will be that a man must either volunteer or be drafted.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I have previously said, now that the Senate has spent almost all afternoon on this amendment, I am very anxious that it come to a vote. Regardless of whether the amendment is modified or is not modified, I hope it will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just a few words to say. However, before I make what will be not more than a 5-minute speech, I wish to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon requests the yeas and nays on his amendment lettered "G."

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to summarize my position on the amendment by briefly answering the major arguments used against my amendment this afternoon. They were rather interesting arguments, but if I were trying a case I would say most respectfully that most of them would fall under the objection of being irrelevant, immaterial, and inconsequential.

One of the arguments made earlier in the debate this afternoon was that 2 years from now might find us at the end of the session with such a congested calendar that we could not give careful consideration to the question of whether or not we should continue the draft. I think that is not a very sound argument, because I do not know how a bill could receive any more careful consideration or go through a longer hearing, or receive more hours of attention from committee members than we have given to this bill. I answer the argument that we may not have time 2 years hence to consider this problem, Mr. President, by offering a record of the Armed Services Committee over weeks and weeks of hearings on this bill in this crowded session of Congress as my exhibit A in complete rebuttal of that argument. We can take judicial notice that this issue will always receive thorough attention by Congress.

Second, I am privileged to say, because several Senators have said to me in the cloakroom they are inclined to go along with the committee report, that a good many members of the Armed Services Committee, of which I also am a member, have reconsidered very carefully the provision of the bill for a 5-year draft and have decided to vote for my amendment. I am privileged to say that at least five of us on the Armed Services Committee intend to vote for my amendment for a 2-year period instead of a 5-year period. I say that because I want the Members of this body to know that there has been

a considerable amount of rethinking about the provision within the Armed Services Committee, and there is not on this provision, as there is on most sections of the bill, a unanimous report of the Armed Services Committee.

Then, it has been told me that one point of view I have expressed here this afternoon has raised some question in the minds of some Senators. I refer to my suggestion that at the end of 2 years this question would be an issue in the election and the people of the United States would have an opportunity to express themselves on it in choosing at the ballot box their representatives in one branch of the Congress, and a third of their representatives in the other branch. The feeling of some Senators seems to be that possibly this issue should not be invited into that campaign, as my amendment might tend to do.

My answer to that is, I know absolutely nothing of greater concern to the American people than the type of military establishment which shall be maintained in time of peace. If after 2 years it is the judgment of the American people that the draft should not be continued, then I think they should have an opportunity to make that perfectly clear to men running for office in the 1950 election. That is my conception of the good old American democratic process working in accordance with the ideal representative government. I think this issue should be referred to the American people in that election.

The third point I want to make is by way of answer to the argument which has been advanced here and which I think really lets the opponent's cat out of the bag. It was argued by one Senator that it would be easier to secure adoption of a resolution to end the draft than it would be to obtain agreement to a resolution to continue the draft. So far as I am concerned that argument proves the desirability of my amendment. I think we, the representatives of the people, must constantly keep our legislative process operating in a manner so affirmative action on our part will be taken in accordance with the dictates and will of the people. I do not think we should now pass a bill which will make it possible to continue the draft for 5 years when we have come to believe the people of the country might not approve such action. What I think we should do, if we are to keep faith with the democratic process, is to bind ourselves now by my amendment to take affirmative action in 2 years to decide whether we shall continue the draft. That will be carrying out representative government in a true sense.

The fourth point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that at the present time I am satisfied the whole question of the Military Establishment is being over-sold to the American people. There is an emergency. I have demonstrated by my acts on the Armed Services Committee and by the position I have taken on various issues on the floor of the Senate that I intend to do what in my judgment is necessary to build up the national defenses. But I think I would be failing in my duty to the Members of the Senate who are not members of the Armed Services Committee if I did not tell them it is

my judgment, after listening to hearings for many weeks, that there are those in the armed services who are over-selling this emergency. In my judgment such drastic action as the armed services would have had us take early in our hearings is not required.

Let the Senate recall that some of the recommendations which came to us at one time would have totaled about \$21,000,000,000 of annual expenditures for the Military Establishment, had we adopted their recommendation. We have it cut down now to \$15,000,000,000 of annual cost, in round figures.

I want to see the obligation and responsibility placed upon the Congress to review at the end of 2 years the policy now being adopted, and at that time decide whether or not we want to continue the draft. I think it will be found that after 2 years our reserves will have been built up, and that we shall have done a pretty good job of educating the American people to an understanding of the need for supporting an adequate Military Establishment.

Let us not fool ourselves. Tonight in America it is touch and go on the whole question of military legislation. There is serious question whether on a referendum a majority of the American people would even vote for a draft on a 2-year basis. But I am convinced my amendment, if the American people had a chance to pass final judgment on it, would receive the approval of a majority.

The last point is, my amendment is in line with action already taken by the House. The House voted a 2-year provision. I think, Mr. President, we should follow in this instance the action taken by the House, and adopt my amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I merely want to point out that the distinguished Senator from Oregon and myself seem to be substantially in agreement on this proposal. I disagree, however, as to the length of time the pending measure should be in force. I feel it should be 3 years, not 2.

The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] earlier this afternoon very well covered the subject. I attempted later on to cover another aspect of it. At this particular time I desire to point out that later on it presumably will not be merely a question of discontinuing selective service. Presumably there will have to be a quid pro quo, a substitute for selective service when that time comes. It seems to me altogether inadvisable for the Congress in an election year to be considering a question of this nature. The very fact that we are confronted today with the problem now before us at a time when we find ourselves faced with an election, is indicative of what we would face 2 years hence.

I think a 3-year limitation is far sounder than would be the 2-year limitation proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. That is why I have placed before the Senate my proposed modification of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the

Senator from New York to the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] would vote "nay."

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

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	McCarthy	Taft
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Malone	Umstead
Eastland	Maybank	Watkins
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Flanders	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Hill	O'Connor	Young
Hoey	O'Daniel	

NAYS—33

Ball	Hawkes	Martin
Brewster	Hayden	Myers
Cain	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Capper	Holland	Reed
Cordon	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Donnell	Lodge	Saltonstall
Ecton	Lucas	Smith
Ellender	McFarland	Stennis
Feazel	McGrath	Thye
Green	McKellar	Tydings
Gurney	McMahon	Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin	Downey	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Hatch	Tobey
Bricker	Jenner	Wagner
Bridges	McCarran	White
Bushfield	Magnuson	
Connally	Taylor	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment lettered "G" was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2152) to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks.

The message also announced that the House had agreed 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. 5770) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 15 and 34 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the present occupant of the chair please state the parliamentary situation, what is before the Senate, and who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that it was agreed prior to the vote that immediately after the vote had been taken the Senator from North Dakota would be recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill is the pending business, and open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is the unfinished business and open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask whether the distinguished Senator from Oregon has concluded with his amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not qualified to say.

Mr. MORSE. I have one further amendment. It is my desire, if the acting majority leader will permit the exercise of the desire, when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] shall have concluded, that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] be allowed to present his amendment, and then the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and that I follow them with my last amendment.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am really trying to expedite the procedure for the remainder of the session today, and I was endeavoring to ascertain how many amendments

there were to be offered, and how long the session would have to run tonight. As I understand, then, there is the one amendment of the Senator from Oregon, there is the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. And the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and I take it there will be an amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Georgia has been endeavoring all day to secure an opportunity to offer an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly every Senator will have an opportunity to offer any amendment he desires to offer. Has the Senator from Texas an amendment to offer?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, in the face of those facts, it would seem almost conclusive that there will be quite a lengthy session tonight, that we will run until a reasonable hour, whatever hour pleases the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator will keep the Senate in session until I get an opportunity to present my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall certainly try to do so. The Senate was in session last night until 10:30, and will remain in session tonight, if it is agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will be agreeable to me. Most of yesterday and all of today I have been earnestly seeking an opportunity to offer an amendment. I should not like to have my amendment to the last amendment to be considered before the vote on the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will appreciate the Senator's stating his inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire as to who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent agreement, prior to the taking of the last vote, the Senator from North Dakota was granted permission to have the floor after the vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, just before I left the floor, a few minutes ago, I asked the Senator from North Dakota to yield to me that I might ask him one question. The question was as to how long he proposed to hold the floor. He advised the Senator from Illinois that he expected to speak for 1 hour. On the way to my office I heard the bells ringing for a quorum call.

I do not know what took place while I was going between the Senate Chamber and my office to sign my mail. Nevertheless, that is the situation, and I was a little bit disappointed as a result of the understanding I had before I left the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the present occupant of the chair remembers, the Senator from North Dakota said

that it was his intention to speak for another hour. Shortly after making that declaration he yielded the floor to another Senator, reserving his right to speak for that hour, and following the unanimous consent agreement which gave the Senator from North Dakota possession of the floor after the vote was taken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think in fairness to the distinguished Senator from Illinois—

Mr. LUCAS. I submit that such was a very peculiar arrangement, in view of the previous understanding the acting minority leader had before he left the floor. I think in all fairness the acting minority leader should have been notified of any different arrangement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair did not happen to be in the chair at the time of the colloquy to which the Senator from Illinois now refers.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope this will not be repeated if I should happen to leave the floor between now and the next 15 or 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state he has been informed that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] requested unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota might continue after the vote, in order to permit disposition of the amendment which has just been acted upon.

Mr. WHERRY. I was absent, and I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota. Was a quorum call had prior to the time the vote was taken?

Mr. LANGER. It was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call was had. There were a number of Senators in the Senate Chamber at the time the unanimous-consent request in favor of the Senator from North Dakota was made, and there was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the agreement made before the quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was made before the quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. What good is a quorum call after a unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into?

Mr. WHERRY. A vote was had, was it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the quorum call was for a vote.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator from Illinois is interested in is keeping a certain agreement that was definitely made before the Senator from Illinois left. In the interest of keeping dignity and decorum in the United States Senate, it seems to me that agreement should have been kept, or at least the Senator from Illinois should have been notified if it was going to be nullified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair not having been aware of the tentative agreement, can only reflect that the agreement must be reconciled between the Senator from

Illinois and the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois, most respectfully, that I was in the chair of the acting majority leader at the time. As I remember, there was no agreement. The Senator from North Dakota said he expected to talk about another hour. Shortly after that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] asked for the opportunity to put something into the RECORD. It was granted him, and before the Senator from North Dakota resumed, under the agreement that he would have unanimous consent to resume, the Senator from South Dakota asked if the Senator from North Dakota objected to a vote being taken on the Morse amendment at that time. There was no agreement of any kind, as I remember.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand there was no agreement entered into by the Senate, but certainly there was a gentleman's understanding as to what would happen during the next hour.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The quorum call was had so as to notify Senators that there was going to be a vote. That was the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator from Massachusetts distinctly understood what I said, and the questions I propounded to the Senator from North Dakota and the answers I received. Certain Senators on this side of the aisle desired to leave for a short period of time on important business, and when the Senator from North Dakota said it would take him an hour at least to speak, we believed what he said.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a simple matter of courtesy, when the Senator asked me, I said casually, "I expect to talk an hour." After that, in fairness to the Senator from South Dakota, I permitted a vote on the Morse amendment. I resent the Senator saying I promised him I was going to speak an hour. I gave my best judgment at that time. I wish to say now that I am going to talk for an hour, so if he wants to go downtown, I guarantee I will be talking here an hour from now. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is greatly intrigued by the last statement of the Senator from North Dakota. He is usually a man of his word, and keeps his word. The only thing the Senator from Illinois is complaining about—and I think I have a right to complain—is that the Senator from North Dakota said, "You can go any place for the next hour, and eat, or anything you want to do, because I am going to speak an hour," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who was in the chair at that time, indicated that the length of the time of the hour of the Senator from North Dakota was usually more than that, and I had no hesitancy in leaving. The only point I am making is that had I left the Capitol for dinner I would have missed the important vote just taken, and I do not think that as the acting minority leader, and after having what seemed to be a fair and honest understanding, I should be ignored with respect to this particular roll call and the unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator from North Dakota may

resent what I said; but, Mr. President, I sincerely resent this type of parliamentary procedure. I have a right to resent it, and I hope the Senator from North Dakota will keep his word this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to make it plain again that there was no agreement. I told the distinguished Senator I expected to talk for an hour. It was purely a matter of courtesy that I made that statement to him. The next time I am asked I will say I shall talk for a minute, so that Senator will not leave the Chamber.

Mr. President, as I was saying a while ago—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is now before the Senate? I have lost track of whether there is an amendment pending or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the fact that there is no amendment pending, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, in line 4, after the word "compensation", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in order thoroughly to inform the Senator from Maryland, I shall state the amendment. It is on page 65, line 4, to insert certain words after the word "compensation." I will read the subparagraph as it will read with my amendment included in it:

(d) Fair and just compensation, but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital, shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

At the time I yielded, Mr. President, I was discussing the testimony of Henry A. Wallace. As I stated at that time, there were certain Senators on the floor who were not familiar with what had transpired just before I took the floor. One distinguished Senator had quoted General Bradley as saying that this country was in danger, and another Senator had quoted from General Marshall. I said I felt it only fair under those circumstances to quote from Henry A. Wallace. As I said at that time, it was only comparatively a short time ago that the Democrats, in a national convention held in 1940, I believe, looked all over the United States for a man with the capacity, the brains, the integrity, the experience, the qualifications, and the character to succeed Franklin Delano Roosevelt in case anything untoward should happen to him.

Mr. Roosevelt himself agreed, together with Mr. Pendergast, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Frank Hague, and other gentlemen who at that time were a component part of the Democratic Party, that by all odds the best man to succeed Franklin Delano Roosevelt in case anything untoward should happen was Henry A. Wallace. So Mr. Wallace, who had been Secretary of Agriculture, became the Democratic nominee for the office of Vice President. As I remember, one of the very distinguished Senators upon this floor nominated Mr. Wallace to be Vice President upon that occasion. I remember also that he received nearly a unanimous vote, with the exception of certain votes which went to Mr. Paul McNutt and some votes which went to the former Speaker of the House, Mr. Bankhead. In any event, the nomination of Henry A. Wallace for Vice President was finally made unanimous. So in due course of time Henry A. Wallace became the Vice President of the United States.

For 4 years he presided over this body, the overwhelming majority of whose membership were Democratic Senators, and apparently he did such a good job and was so respected and admired and beloved that a majority of the Democratic Members of the Senate decided that he would make a good Secretary of Commerce. I think nearly every Senator is familiar with the great fight which was put up by the, at that time, majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], in behalf of Henry A. Wallace, when his name was sent to the Senate, when nominated to be Secretary of Commerce. I am positive the Record will bear me out in saying that we were told by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that Mr. Henry A. Wallace would make a great Secretary of Commerce.

Of course, there was some objection to him. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] wanted to take away from the Department some of its powers, and the RFC, as I recollect, was removed from the Department, whereupon Henry A. Wallace was confirmed by a majority of the Senate. So, for a comparatively long period of time, Mr. Henry A. Wallace was the Secretary of Commerce.

Here we have a man, Mr. President, who, during all those years, was a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, a man who was chosen by the Democrats coming from every State of the Union, nearly 1,500 of them, meeting, as I recollect, in the city of Chicago, who, after looking over 143,000,000 Americans, finally nominated Mr. Wallace to be a candidate for the Vice Presidency, and then, as I recollect, 26,000,000 Democrats went to the polls and elected him to be Vice President of the United States. I maintain that a man with such a record, even if there is only one chance in a hundred that he is right, nevertheless is entitled to have his views on the pending bill presented to this body, and as apparently no Democrat is willing to present his views I have taken it upon myself to see to it that the views of the former Democratic Vice President of the United States were fair-

ly and honestly presented to the Democratic and Republican Members of the Senate.

What did Mr. Wallace say? As I stated a while ago, he said that in his judgment the only danger to the country is from the administration itself. I read from his testimony in the record up to the time I was interrupted. I shall continue to read from Mr. Wallace's testimony, at page 545:

The current crisis—

Which calls for this bill we are now considering, Mr. Wallace says:

The current crisis was concocted by the administration not only to further the plans for private corporate expansion, but was also intended to forestall a domestic crisis threatened by their policies to date.

That is what Mr. Wallace said. He continued:

Instead of proposing measures for increasing purchasing power and curbing the profiteering of big business, President Truman offered compulsory military training, the draft, and a great increase in arms expenditures as the means of staving off a depression. The day after he read his message to Congress, the Journal of Commerce stated:

"As far as business is concerned, any sizable increase in military expenditures should provide the shot in the arm which, in the opinion of most economists, would be needed to offset the probability of a 1948 business slump."

Those are Mr. Wallace's words, not mine. Mr. Wallace said:

The armaments program, compulsory training, and the draft would be profitable to big business.

I wish to make it clear that those are not my words, but the words of the former Vice President of this country, who was elected on the Democratic ticket, with Democratic support, with practically every Senator supporting him.

Mr. Wallace continued:

For the common man, they mean harder work and lower living standards. He will make the sacrifices, while the corporations will add armament profits to inflation profits. Mr. Ira Mosher, chairman of the finance committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, admitted this in the following comment on the remobilization program:

"It is going to cost a lot of work—a lot of work building things and growing things—for which American workers and farmers are not going to receive one red cent in purchasing power for a long, long time, and maybe never."

That was said by Mr. Ira Mosher, chairman of the finance committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. He was quoted by Mr. Wallace.

Mr. Wallace, the same Mr. Wallace who testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, continued:

As I said earlier, when there is evidence that the big industrialists and financiers are willing to share equally with workers, farmers, and youth in the burden of national defense, I shall believe there is a legitimate crisis.

So according to Mr. Wallace there is no crisis at all. I maintain that that statement should be entitled to some weight in the minds of Democrats in the Senate. Here are the two leading Dem-

ocrats of the United States, President Truman, on the one hand, and Henry A. Wallace, on the other. They disagree. One says there is a crisis, and the other says there is none. What are we poor Republicans on this side of the aisle to do? Mr. Truman says there is a crisis. Henry A. Wallace, who at one time had only one heartbeat between him and the Presidency, says that there is no crisis. So I conceive this statement to be very important. I believe that the Members of this body should at least give it a great deal of study, because, as I have said, if there is one chance in a hundred that Mr. Wallace is right, every Senator should have the patience to examine the record thoroughly to see what the probability is even of that one chance in a hundred.

There is much to what Mr. Wallace says. Earlier I read that Mr. Wallace stated that big business had been making a great deal of money out of World War II. He stated that—

The armaments program, compulsory training, and the draft would be profitable to big business.

An hour or so ago when I challenged any Member of this body on the other side of the aisle to prove that Mr. Wallace's statement was not true, even though I allowed an opportunity for a reply, no Democrat rose to defend the former Democratic Vice President of the United States. In view of the fact that no Democrat who was present rose to defend Mr. Wallace, I wish to defend him to some extent by reading what a former Democratic Representative from the State of Washington had to say. This was on January 22, 1946. This statement is found on page A166, volume 92, part 9, of the Appendix of the Record. The speech is captioned "Who Made the Money in This War?" Apparently that was what Mr. Wallace was talking about. I maintain that if money was made during the war the Democrats are to blame, because they had control of the House; they had control of the Senate, and they had control of the White House. So everything that was said by Mr. John M. Coffee, a Democratic Representative from the State of Washington, was said about the Democratic Administration. At that time the Republicans were not in control. So if all this money was made by what Mr. Wallace now calls big business, it was made while Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President and Henry A. Wallace was Vice President of the United States. When I speak of the record, I speak of the Democratic record. I quote from a Democrat, Mr. Coffee, who made this speech on the 22d day of January 1946—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I guaranteed that I would speak for an hour. I do not see why I should be interrupted.

I quote from the speech of Hon. John M. Coffee, a Representative in Congress

from the State of Washington, made on January 22, 1946:

Mr. Speaker, there are many citizens who are disturbed and perturbed by the spectacle of the vast fortunes made during this war by profiteers and racketeers.

This is a Democrat, John M. Coffee, of Washington, a Member of the House of Representatives, speaking about a Democratic administration. In a few weeks the Democrats will hold a convention in Philadelphia, where they will nominate a Democratic ticket. They will be calling upon the people of the country again to trust them and have confidence in them. So I think it is very important, in view of the amendment which I have offered, that we examine thoroughly the record of the Democratic Party, as exposed by a Democratic Representative.

I continue to quote from the speech of Mr. Coffee:

Many will recall that all veterans' organizations adopted resolutions at annual conventions each year, following the end of World War I, in which they proclaimed their relentless hostility to the making of profits out of wars.

According to this Democratic Representative, the Democratic administration was put on notice, because Mr. Coffee said:

Many will recall that all veterans' organizations adopted resolutions at annual conventions each year, following the end of World War I, in which they proclaimed their relentless hostility to the making of profits out of wars.

Year after year they told Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Henry A. Wallace of their relentless hostility to the making of profits out of wars.

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars suggested that we draft property as well as manpower in the next war. This was in the period of 1919 to 1940.

I now challenge any Democratic Senator to deny that before the war the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars suggested to President Roosevelt and to Henry A. Wallace, who now talks about taking the profits out of war, that that be done before we got into World War II.

But when 1940 came, somehow or other the Congress allowed the manufacturers to make the usual commercial killing out of war. With great reluctance and under terrific pressure the Congress finally was compelled to impose an excess-profits tax running up, in some cases, to 90 percent. Great Britain had, from the inception of the war, levied a 100-percent excess-profits tax in addition to granting to a national commission the power arbitrarily to disallow certain corporate expenses claimed against tax charges. Meanwhile we permitted numerous loopholes. Salaries were raised enormously at the beginning, although frozen later.

Again I say, Mr. President, that was under a Democratic national administration. The Republicans are not to blame for that.

I read further from the statement by Representative Coffee:

We proceeded to extend the draft, we raised from \$30 to \$50 a month the compensation paid the inductee. The question arises, Who made the money in this war? In an article in the January 1946 issue of

This Month magazine I have discussed this subject. The article is as follows:

Mr. President, mind you, the article is by Representative John M. Coffee, writing about a Democratic administration, and a part of that administration was Henry A. Wallace, who testified just as I have read from the testimony which he himself gave before the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Here is what Representative Coffee wrote:

WHO MADE THE MONEY IN THIS WAR?

(By Representative John M. Coffee)

When the full bill for participation in the war is presented to the American people, it is expected to total \$336,000,000,000. That is almost 11 times the cost of World War I. It is the equivalent of taking \$2,551 from the pocket of every man, woman, and child in this country.

Mr. President, if \$2,551 was taken out of the pockets of every man, woman, and child in this country, who is to blame? In the article from which I am now reading, we find a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives talking about the Democratic administration. I submit to you that is an issue Mr. Truman will have to face in the coming election. The Republicans were not in power at that time. The House of Representatives was controlled by the Democrats. The Senate was controlled by the Democrats. Yet if Democratic Representative John M. Coffee's statement is true—and I believe it is—the taking of \$2,551 out of the pockets of every man, woman, and child in South Dakota and in every other State of the Union was permitted by a Democratic administration, because the Democrats had control of the lower House and the upper House and the White House.

I read further from the article by Representative Coffee:

That, in dollars and cents, is the price we have paid for victory. It does not take into account the cost in human lives; 259,637 killed, 35,328 missing, 651,934 wounded. It does not include the suffering, the sacrifice, the ultimate waste of war.

There is another side to the ledger, the credit side. For there are those in the United States, as in other countries, who have made an enormous profit from the war.

Mr. President, if an enormous profit was made out of the last World War, who is to blame? Oh, we heard a lot of beautiful phrases from the lips of the then President of the United States. He said many things that sounded very nice. One thing he said was, "We will not permit a single millionaire to be created out of this war." That is one thing he said. How was that promise kept? Why is it that today from one end of the United States to the other the veterans are pouring in to us petitions asking that the profits be taken out of war? I have used their protests as the basis of the amendment, which I now have at the desk, which provides that those profits shall be kept down to 10 percent.

Representative Coffee continued, as follows:

In the years that preceded World War II a series of congressional investigations uncovered startling evidence of World War I profiteering. Public opinion was shocked

and outraged, even though only a meager trickle of the sordid details ever reached it.

That makes the record of the last Democratic administration so much the worse, because the article by Representative Coffee states that the Democratic administration unearthed evidence of graft and greed and war profiteering during World War I; so they were put on notice as to what might happen in World War II.

Mr. Coffee further states in this article:

Evidence was produced, for example, that—British, French, German, and American industrialists made a profit from every soldier killed on either side.

Four years of war profits created 22,000 new millionaires in this country.

Mr. President, how does that jibe with what the late President Roosevelt told us? He said that not a single new millionaire would be created in this country as a result of the war. The Democrats then had control of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the White House. Then how does it happen that we have 22,000 new millionaires? Who is to blame but the Democratic Party which was in control all through that entire situation?

I read further from the article by Representative Coffee:

During the four war years—

The 4 years of World War I, when there was also a Democratic administration; that one was under Woodrow Wilson—1915–18—United States industry made a profit, after taxes, of \$28,500,000,000. Net earnings of United States corporations in those 4 years were as high as in the preceding 10 years.

By 1926, according to a Federal Trade Commission report, 59 percent of the Nation's material was in the hands of 1 percent of the population; 31 percent was owned by 12 percent of the people; the vast majority (87 percent) owned less than 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

About 30 percent of the national wealth was owned by corporations. Some 70 percent of all corporate stock was owned by only 1 percent of the stockholders.

Thus, as the Nation increased in wealth, its people as a whole became poorer. More economic power passed into the hands of fewer men. War had accelerated this process.

Just after Pearl Harbor the late President Roosevelt pledged that there would be no profiteering from this war.

Representative Coffee himself says that the President pledged that.

I read further from Representative Coffee's article:

It was precisely to prevent the excesses of World War I that Congress imposed heavy war taxes (in some cases four times the pre-war level) and applied a surplus-profits tax to all corporate earnings.

The extent to which this noble purpose was fulfilled has just been revealed in separate studies made by Government and private agencies. Here are some of their conclusions:

Net profits (about \$56,000,000,000) made by United States corporations during World War II far exceeded those recorded in any similar period in history.

Mr. President, that is the Democratic record. Democratic Representative John M. Coffee, of Washington, says so.

He says further in the article:

Net profits (about \$58,000,000,000) made by United States corporations during World War II far exceeded those recorded in any similar period in history. During this war the number of billion-dollar companies in the United States increased by 11, making a total of 43.

Despite high war and excess-profits taxes, net profits after taxes of industry (1940-45) averaged 250 percent above prewar levels.

Since Pearl Harbor (1942-45) profits after taxes averaged 300 percent above prewar levels.

But even this picture is not complete, because it is an over-all picture. It includes all corporations, big and small alike, and many of the small ones went out of business during the war years or only just broke even. This means that if we consider only those corporations and industries which recorded a profit, the size of their earnings will stagger us even more.

I wish we could get this record into the hands of every Democrat in the country.

Take a look at the percentage increases in 1944 earnings, compiled by the OPA. Compare with average prewar (1936-39) earnings in the same industries. Motor-vehicle parts (increased) 896 percent.

While American boys were dying over there—boys whose comrades have protested in the testimony on the pending measure—while the boys over there were losing arms and legs and being made blind, motor-vehicle-parts profits increased 896 percent.

Iron, steel, and byproducts, 252 percent; lumber and timber byproducts, 1,064 percent.

An enormous increase, Mr. President, all at a time when the Democrats were in full control of the administration.

Electrical machinery, 434 percent.

That is more than four times as high as it was before. I am talking about the profits.

Communications equipment, 521 percent.

The profit became five times as great as it was before the war.

Industrial electrical equipment, 399 percent; other electrical products, 772 percent.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that some of the boys who lost their legs and arms feel that possibly after all there is something wrong with the Government?

Nonelectrical machinery, 360 percent; engines and turbines—

They were patriots, Mr. President, who said they would not go to work, they would not manufacture anything unless the Government guaranteed their profits. Those big corporations said that labor, when they went on strike, were unpatriotic and disloyal. Do you know, Mr. President, how much the profits were on the manufacture of engines and turbines? They show an increase of 2,431 percent. Where the manufacturers made \$100 before the war, they made \$24,310 during the war. Is it any wonder that Mr. Wallace came before the committee and said, "Before we pass this bill I want a guarantee that these big industrialists, these big manufacturers, are going to have their profits limited?" In the amendment I have offered I provide that a profit of 10 percent is enough—not 2,431 percent.

The manufacturers robbed and looted the families of the soldiers, their brothers and sisters and sweethearts and other relatives. They knew that engines and turbines were needed. The sky was the limit. I repeat, where they used to make \$100 in profit, they made \$24,310. Those are the people about whom Henry Wallace talked. That is why no member of the committee interrogated him about it. That is why Mr. Wallace said:

I am waiting for the industrialists and financiers who now profit from these war preparations to say:

"We are patriotic Americans. We are alarmed at threats to our country. For the duration of the crisis we are giving up all profits, all dividends, all huge salaries. Everything above normal living expenses belongs to the Treasury of the United States, and we want the Congress to put this into law until the emergency ends. We refuse to take a penny of profit for the defense of our country. We stand with the boys who are drafted in making sacrifices for freedom."

But, Mr. President, I have not noticed a single large corporation, a single large industrialist making such an offer as this. If the program goes over, the same men, who have made millions and millions—altogether 72 millionaires were created in World War I—or their sons or their successors—will be here, a new crop, robbing the American people of every single dollar they can, unless my amendment is adopted limiting profits to 10 percent.

Let us go back to the speech of the Honorable John Coffee. How about transportation equipment? We have heard a great deal about the railroads. The transportation equipment industry made a profit of 658 percent higher than before the war. What about aircraft and parts? They knew the armed services had to have aircraft.

Aircraft profits increased 1,686 percent; railroad equipment, 318 percent; food and kindred products, 150 percent; meat products, 271 percent; apparel, 280 percent; textile-mill products, 522 percent; petroleum and coal products, 159 percent; rubber products, 698 percent.

Mr. President, that was nearly seven times as much profit as was earned before the war.

Bituminous and other soft coal, 1,148 percent.

That is 11½ times as much profit as they earned before the war.

I read further:

And here is how the special Senate committee investigating the national defense program summed up the situation:

"The Planning Division of the War Production Board has estimated that net profits, after renegotiation and taxes, of the war industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, and rubber) for the four war years will be about \$16,000,000,000."

The boys in Walter Reed Hospital, with one leg or both legs gone, or with one arm or both arms gone, or with one eye or both eyes gone, could reflect on how their Government had betrayed them. Mr. President, that was a Democratic administration. Henry A. Wallace was a part of it. He came before us and testified. He can say this much in his own favor, that, after all, he only presided over the Senate. He had no active part. Be that

as it may, I give him credit for the fact that he is now protesting. That is more than many other Democrats are doing. He is now saying that he wants these excess war profits eliminated, or, if corporations make such enormous profits, he wants them taxed.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered limits those profits to 10 percent. That is more than the average man makes on his investment. Much is said about risk. How often we have heard upon the floor that a corporation will not expand, will not take any risk, unless it receives a profit. It is passing strange that we now find that most of the large new plants were built by the Government, built by taxpayers' money. There is a great plant in Utah which was sold for almost nothing on the dollar. Who bought it? The United States Steel Corp. So the great corporations came out of the war not only with huge profits, but owning some of the greatest plants in the world, which were built by the Government. We recently saw an example of what they did when the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] reported on the oil situation in the east, where our Government was promised delivery of oil at 40 cents a barrel. When the Navy wanted it for 40 cents a barrel it did not get it. No. It had to pay \$1.10 a barrel. The Senator said in his report that the oil companies in the east were selling oil to other countries at from 45 to 55, or 60 cents a barrel.

I protest, Mr. President, against passing the kind of a bill we are about to pass, containing no limitation of 10 percent on profits. I hope I shall be able to get a yea-and-nay vote on the bill.

I read further:

The Senate committee also investigated the relative earnings of the 100 United States corporations which had the largest volume of war business. They discovered that, after all deductions for wartime taxes in 1942, 3 companies made more than 10 times their average prewar net profit; 19 earned more than three times prewar profits; 24 others between one and three times normal profits. Of the remainder, 12 companies which had shown average deficits during the prewar base period, earned in 1942 a net profit of between one and eighteen million dollars.

Mr. President, if a farmer in Montana, for instance, said, "I am not going to raise any crop unless I am guaranteed a profit," he would be called a Communist, just as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] was called a Communist in more than a hundred letters, which I mentioned today, because he dared to be for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. If that farmer said, "I want to be guaranteed a profit for raising wheat or barley or rye," he would take his chances, Mr. President. The farmer is the biggest gambler in the world. He gambles, when he seeds his crop, that it may not rain. He gambles that the frost may not come and take it. He gambles that after it is up the drought may not come and take it. It may not rain during the growing season. He gambles that when the grain is about to head out a hot wind will not come and shrivel the grain. He gambles, Mr. President, that the grain may not be killed by hail or by chinch bugs, and he gambles that after he has threshed it and

after it is in the granary or elevator, the price may not be forced down to the point where the grain would be produced at a loss. He is not guaranteed anything; but these large corporations said, when the war broke out, "No; we are not going to build anything unless we are guaranteed a profit."

This man, John Coffee, Mr. President, is a smart man. He is a patriotic man. He says this:

Many of us have criticized organized labor for striking in wartime, and believe even now that labor demands for increased wages are unreasonable. Unions have been accused of being unpatriotic. But let's look at their side of the picture.

Surely, Mr. President, we heard about John Lewis striking in the middle of the wartime. He was unpatriotic, he was everything that the big coal companies could lay their tongues to, everything that the controlled press could say about him that was untrue. John Lewis organized more than 400,000 men. They were working at starvation wages and he organized them and during wartime they produced more coal per capita than had ever been produced before in the history of this country.

When Mr. Lewis testified before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs he said to one distinguished Senator, "All we are asking is 6 days' work, 8 hours a day. We are protesting that in the summertime we can work only 2 or 3 days a week."

He gave the average figures, and showed that those men did not get calories enough to keep body and soul together, and of course they struck because of the high cost of living. The very fact that the big coal companies made a new contract with them and paid them more showed that those coal companies knew deep down in their hearts that John Lewis was right and they were wrong.

Mr. Coffee says:

The cost of living, as every housewife knows, has gone up tremendously during the war years. A large part of the increased wages has gone simply to pay for that inflation. The unions, according to their own research bureaus and the evidence of Government agencies, know that the corporations have been making these fantastic profits.

A study, called Five Years of War Profits, published by the Research Bureau of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO), reveals further facts on the earnings of big corporations. It may be assumed that the unions base their decisions to strike or not to strike on these revelations. The study claims that 200 great steel corporations earned more than \$2,000,000,000 in open and concealed profits during the war.

Mr. President, these companies can conceal their profits, but a farmer cannot conceal anything if he has a crop. They even go out and measure the number of acres a poor farmer has. Senators will remember that under the soil-conservation program a farmer was allowed so many acres for wheat, and if he exceeded that he lost everything he was supposed to get.

I remember a poor farmer in North Dakota who was brave enough to go out among the hills and plow the ravines

in the hills and put in a crop. Of course it was pretty hard to measure in the ravines and follow the gullies. The poor fellow planted half an acre in excess of what he was allowed, and it cost him \$431. It is all right to soak the poor, defenseless farmers.

The record shows that in the Supreme Court appeals were made by some of the farmers which in every instance were turned down. In one decision a year ago the Supreme Court of the United States held by a vote of 5 to 4 that a farmer is presumed to read the Federal Register every day in order to find out what the last regulations of the department are. Imagine a farmer having time to read the Federal Register. The Government publishes thousands upon thousands of rules and regulations in that Register. It is an insult to the farmers to say that they should set aside their work and read the Federal Register.

Mr. Coffee continued:

From 1940 to 1945 the industry averaged a profit, after taxes, of \$245,000,000 per year. Total reported profits in the steel industry, after taxes, for comparative periods are:

1936-39	\$576,000,000
1940-44	\$1,225,000,000
Increase (percent)	113

The United Auto Workers Union has released a study of 26 aircraft companies and their earnings during comparative years. The percentage increase in this industry is even more staggering:

1936-39	\$20,554,274
1941-44	\$173,598,422
Increase (percent)	745

Mr. President, is it any wonder that the veterans write to us saying there is something wrong in this country? There is something wrong. It was only a short time ago that 98 veterans were unable to get taxi licenses in the city of Philadelphia. They had gone forth and fought for their country, the majority of them were married, some had children, and all they wanted was to come back and drive taxis in Philadelphia. The board in that city would not let them do it. The taxicab companies and others got out an injunction. The boys offered to haul the passengers in Philadelphia and take their chances of making a living by taking tips, believe it or not. The opposition sued out an injunction to keep those 98 veterans from making a living. I appealed to the Public Service Commission over there. We had one of them down before the Committee on the Judiciary, and we got exactly nowhere. They said they would give the veterans a hearing. Under State law they could give them a hearing, but they could hear one veteran at a time. They could take that one veteran's case and have it drag along 3 or 4 or 5 weeks, and that is what they did.

Mr. President, this article written by John M. Coffee is almost unbelievable. If I did not know him to be an honest, patriotic, God-fearing man, I would not believe the article, but he has the proof that word for word what he says is true.

Think of it, Mr. President, while our boys were dying, while old men went out and did the work on the farms all over

the Northwest so that the boys could go to war, while all the women were scrimping to get enough to buy a \$25 bond, the manufacturers of engines and turbines raised their profits so that their percentage of profit increased 2,431 percent, and not a single one of them was put in jail.

As I said earlier this afternoon, Mr. President, we have had no enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act, regardless of whether there was a Republican or a Democratic administration in power. Mark Hanna was once asked who he favored for President. He said, "I do not care who is President. Give me the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury, and you can take the President." Not a single man has been put in jail for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 57 years. Oh, but if a GI returns home and steals a loaf of bread to feed his hungry family, he is arrested, and I will tell you, Mr. President, he has an awful time to keep from being put in the calaboose. A man or a woman engaged in the grocery business, who sometime ago, sold bread at one-half a cent more than the price fixed by OPA, would find his place visited by a horde of inspectors and arrested and fined in triple damages. But the great trusts which were combining to raise the prices of bread and milk, and raised them time after time, were safe from prosecution.

Mr. President, some months ago the Senate confirmed the nomination of a certain individual to be an ambassador from this country. I read his record to the Senate. I objected to his confirmation. I showed that companies in which he was interested had bought up 300 dairies. Nobody went to jail for that. When my committee subpoenaed one of the Assistant Attorneys General in charge of the Antitrust Division, who had been in charge of that division for years, he said they never arrested such persons; they simply sued them for \$5,000. They did not arrest them, he said, because it might hurt their social standing. Imagine hurting the social standing of a man who was robbing and fleeing the people of this country. I have always been glad that after I got through with that gentleman he went back to the Office of the Attorney General and resigned his position as a Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. President, I read further from Mr. Coffee's article:

According to a United Press survey, some of the giants and their assets are:

Metropolitan Life,	almost \$7,000,000,000.
Bell Telephone,	more than \$6,000,000,000.
Prudential,	more than \$5,000,000,000.
Chase National Bank,	more than \$5,000,000,000.
Pennsylvania Railroad,	almost \$3,000,000,000.
Standard Oil of New Jersey,	\$2,400,000,000.
General Motors,	\$2,100,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article written by former Representative John M. Coffee printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ecton in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

WHO MADE THE MONEY IN THIS WAR?

(By Representative John N. Coffee)

When the full bill for participation in the war is presented to the American people, it is expected to total \$336,000,000,000. That is almost 11 times the cost of World War I. It is the equivalent of taking \$2,551 from the pocket of every man, woman, and child in this country.

That, in dollars and cents, is the price we have paid for victory. It does not take into account the cost in human lives; 259,637 killed, 35,328 missing, 651,934 wounded. It does not include the suffering, the sacrifice, and ultimate waste of war.

There is another side to the ledger, the credit side. For there are those in the United States, as in other countries, who have made an enormous profit from the war.

In the years that preceded World War II a series of congressional investigations uncovered startling evidence of World War I profiteering. Public opinion was shocked and outraged, even though only a meager trickle of the sordid details ever reached it. Evidence was produced, for example, that—

British, French, German, and American industrialists made a profit from every soldier killed on either side.

Four years of war profits created 22,000 new millionaires in this country.

During the 4 war years—1915-18—United States industry made a profit, after taxes, of \$28,500,000,000. Net earnings of United States corporations in those 4 years were as high as in the preceding 10 years.

By 1926, according to a Federal Trade Commission report, 59 percent of the Nation's material was in the hands of 1 percent of the population; 31 percent was owned by 12 percent of the people; the vast majority (87 percent) owned less than 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

About 30 percent of the national wealth was owned by corporations. Some 70 percent of all corporate stock was owned by only 1 percent of the stockholders.

Thus, as the Nation increased in wealth, its people as a whole became poorer. More economic power passed into the hands of fewer men. War had accelerated this process.

Just after Pearl Harbor the late President Roosevelt pledged that there would be no profiteering from this war. It was precisely to prevent the excesses of World War I that Congress imposed heavy war taxes (in some cases four times the prewar level) and applied a surplus-profits tax to all corporate earnings.

The extent to which this noble purpose was fulfilled has just been revealed in separate studies made by Government and private agencies. Here are some of their conclusions:

Net profits (about \$56,000,000,000) made by United States corporations during World War II, far exceeded those recorded in any similar period in history.

During this war the number of billion-dollar companies in the United States increased by 11, making a total of 43.

Despite high war and excess-profits taxes, net profits after taxes of industry (1940-45) averaged 250 percent above prewar levels.

Since Pearl Harbor (1942-45) profits after taxes averaged 300 percent above prewar levels.

But even this picture is not complete, because it is an over-all picture. It includes all corporations, big and small alike, and many of the small ones went out of business during the war years or only just broke even. This means that if we consider only those corporations and industries which recorded a profit, the size of their earnings will stagger us even more.

Take a look at these percentage increases in 1944 earnings, compiled by the OPA.

Compare with average prewar (1936-39) earnings in the same industries.

	Percent
Motor-vehicle parts.....	896
Iron, steel, and byproducts.....	252
Lumber and timber byproducts.....	1,064
Electrical machinery.....	434
Communications equipment.....	521
Industrial electrical equipment.....	399
Other electrical products.....	772
Nonelectrical machinery.....	360
Engines and turbines.....	2,431
Transportation equipment.....	658
Aircraft and parts.....	1,686
Railroad equipment.....	318
Food and kindred products.....	150
Meat products.....	271
Apparel.....	230
Textile-mill products.....	522
Petroleum and coal products.....	159
Rubber products.....	698
Bituminous and other soft coal.....	1,148

And here is how the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program summed up the situation:

"The Planning Division of the War Production Board has estimated that net profits, after renegotiation and taxes, of the war industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, and rubber) for the four war years will be about \$16,000,000,000. Since the proportion of civilian business in these industries had been very small, almost all these profits may be regarded as coming from Government business. Such profits are about twice the prewar average of such industries."

The Senate committee also investigated the relative earnings of the 100 United States corporations which had the largest volume of war business. They discovered that, after all deductions for wartime taxes in 1942, 3 companies made more than 10 times their average prewar net profit; 19 earned more than three times prewar profits; 24 others between one and three times normal profits. Of the remainder, 12 companies which had shown average deficits during the prewar base period, earned in 1942 a net profit of between one and eighteen million dollars.

Many of us have criticized organized labor for striking in wartime and believe even now that labor demands for increased wages are unreasonable. Unions have been accused of being unpatriotic. But let's look at their side of the picture.

The cost of living, as every housewife knows, has gone up tremendously during the war years. A large part of the increased wages has gone simply to pay for that inflation. The unions, according to their own research bureaus and the evidence of Government agencies, know that the corporations have been making these fantastic profits.

A study, called Five Years of War Profits, published by the Research Bureau of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO), reveals further facts on the earnings of big corporations. It may be assumed that the unions base their decisions to strike or not to strike on these revelations. The study claims that 200 great steel corporations earned more than \$2,000,000,000 in open and concealed profits during the war. From 1940 to 1945 the industry averaged a profit, after taxes, of \$245,000,000 per year. Total reported profits in the steel industry, after taxes, for comparative periods are:

1936-39.....	\$576,000,000
1940-44.....	\$1,225,000,000
Increase (percent).....	113

The United Auto Workers Union has released a study of 26 aircraft companies and their earnings during comparative years. The percentage increase in this industry is even more staggering.

1936-39.....	\$20,554,274
1941-44.....	\$173,598,422
Increase (percent).....	745

If you have ever wondered how to make ends meet after you've paid your taxes, and how an extra few dollars a week would help that household budget, you'll be interested in these statistics on some of the aircraft industries. All these are profits after taxes and include postwar and contingency reserves.

	1936-39 average	1941-44 average	Percent increase
Bell Aircraft.....	\$32,493	\$3,845,404	11,743
Bellanca Aircraft.....	6,153	323,336	5,155
Bendix Aviation.....	2,480,061	17,883,326	621
Boeing Airplane.....	840,038	7,294,040	868
Consolidated Vultee.....	823,702	16,957,763	1,959
Curtiss-Wright.....	2,054,566	125,351,791	755
Glenn L. Martin.....	2,083,787	13,599,776	551
Wright Aeronautical.....	2,544,172	11,517,484	353

¹ Average for 3 years.

While making these profits, however, most companies were not generous with their stockholders. Dividend payments have by no means kept pace with the sharp advance in net profits. If they had, distribution of wealth would have been a little wider. The fact is that corporations paid out a much smaller proportion of their profits in dividends during the war than ever before. Prior to 1940, dividend payments were often two-thirds of net profits; since then they have averaged less than half. While the net income of incorporated business increased 134 percent between 1939 and 1944, dividends in the same period increased only 18 percent.

Reason? The conservative financial magazine Business Week of August 11, 1945, attributes it to the belief that high dividends at a time when war business alone was furnishing most corporate profits would invite public criticism.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that management had at its disposal a working capital 88 percent greater than in 1938. The figure in dollars had jumped from twenty-five billion in 1939 to forty-seven billion in 1945. One result was that corporations had to raise very little new capital for wartime expansion. At the same time, losses in enemy countries were written off or provided for through reserves. Investment in new plants was kept below depreciation charges, written off against taxes, charged to current operating expenses, or financed directly by the Federal Government.

And thus corporations have piled up \$31,000,000,000 in undistributed profits and reserves during the war. They have also paid off a billion dollars in long-term debts.

A break-down of assets in the 200 great steel companies, as published by the United Steelworkers of America, further clarifies the situation.

	January 1940	January 1945	In- crease
			Per- cent
Total assets.....	\$4,860,000,000	\$6,000,000,000	22
Dividend payments.....	419,000,000	765,000,000	82
Working capital.....	1,200,000,000	2,000,000,000	68
General reserves.....	103,000,000	395,000,000	288
Undistributed profits.....	585,000,000	1,000,000,000	81
Total financial resources.....	689,000,000	1,600,000,000	131
Funded debt.....	903,000,000	652,000,000	-28
Excess working capital over funded debt.....	308,000,000	1,393,000,000	363

The above figures give you a picture of the steel industry only. Others, of course, have fared as well. The 11 corporations that graduated into the billionaire class during the war make a total of 43 companies with assets of more than a billion dollars. Forty-third on this list is the Ford Motor Co., with total assets of a mere \$1,021,325,159. But Ford is

exclusively a family holding, while the others are owned by numerous stockholders.

According to a United Press survey, some of the giants and their assets are:

Metropolitan Life, almost \$7,000,000,000.
Bell Telephone, more than \$6,000,000,000.
Prudential, more than \$5,000,000,000.
Chase National Bank, more than \$5,000,000,000.
Pennsylvania Railroad, almost \$3,000,000,000.

Standard Oil of New Jersey, \$2,400,000,000.
General Motors, \$2,100,000,000.

American industry enters the postwar world with a greatly expanded plant and with tools and equipment far surpassing anything it had in the past. According to a report issued by the War Production Board, more than \$25,000,000,000 worth of new plants and equipment were added to the industrial capacity in this country between 1940 and 1944. The Government contributed directly more than two-thirds of the total investment involved.

At the end of 1939 there were 934,000 machine tools in place in this country; by 1944 the number had risen to 1,400,000, an increase of nearly 50 percent. General Motors had 75,000 machine tools in 1940; in October 1943 it reported 143,774 machine tools in place.

Even after industry has financed its own transition to a peacetime production, equal at least to the prewar level of 1941, it will have on hand a fund, estimated by United States Department of Commerce economists in 1944 as between ten and twenty billion dollars left over for plant and other expansion.

It will also get from the Government a flat 10-percent rebate on wartime payments of excess-profits tax as a sort of severance pay to compensate it for the cessation of war contracts. This sum alone amounts to about \$2,840,000,000, and is equal to more than half the total net corporate earnings in the banner year of 1937.

In addition, under the carry-back and carry-forward provisions of the excess-profits tax, United States corporations have accumulated with the Government a sort of unemployment insurance. Should the profits of any company in the next 10 years drop below its so-called normal profit level, it is entitled to a cash refund from the United States Treasury to make good these losses. That refund cannot be greater than the total income and excess-profits tax paid during the war. Theoretically, industry has thus a reserve fund of \$62,000,000,000 to offset reconversion losses.

The steel companies, for example, face reconversion with savings (net working capital) of \$2,000,000,000. Their flat 10-percent rebate from the Treasury will amount to about \$200,000,000 more. If they fail to show a cent of profit in 1946, the Treasury must give them a rebate of \$149,000,000. This last rebate guarantees them 29 percent more profits than they averaged during the years of peace.

Nowhere in the world, in any period of history, have comparable material gains been registered by industry. The war presumably has wiped out German and Japanese industry. Principal industries in Allied countries have suffered so heavily that it will take them a decade or more to regain even prewar production.

American business today is in the position of completely dominating world trade. It has become so strongly entrenched through its war profits that for many years it need fear no real competition anywhere on the globe.

Congress has not yet passed a comprehensive full-employment bill for the American people. But the tax-reduction bill has been rushed through in record time. Principal provision of this bill eliminates the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946. The

total cut in taxes is almost \$6,000,000,000, apportioned as follows between individuals and corporations:

Individuals.....	\$2,784,000,000
Corporations.....	3,136,000,000

The reduction in individual income taxes is overwhelmingly in favor of the larger income groups. The little man gets \$1 a year more to spend; the millionaire gets \$44,218 more.

The 900 largest corporations in this country will get a tax reduction averaging \$2,000,000 each in 1946. This amounts to a benefit twice that of the rest of the 18,000 corporations which have admitted excess profits. There is no gain whatever for the 261,000 smaller corporations that were never able to report excess profits.

At the same time it was revealed that the deficit in the national budget for 1946 is estimated at \$30,000,000,000.

All this, then, must go into the balance in which we weigh our victory. On one side we have the total cost of war: \$336,000,000,000 in cash, plus the dead, the wounded, the missing; on the other the outright profits made by large corporations—some \$56,000,000,000 in cash, plus the power to dominate the lives of our people and the peoples of the world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Coffee has considerable to say about reduction of income taxes. He presented his article on January 22, 1946. This is what he had to say about income taxes:

The steel companies, for example, face reconversion with savings (net working capital) of \$2,000,000,000. Their flat 10-percent rebate from the Treasury will amount to about \$200,000,000 more. If they fail to show a cent of profit in 1946, the Treasury must give them a rebate of \$149,000,000. This last rebate guarantees them 29 percent more profits than they average during the years of peace.

Mr. President, suppose a farmer said to the Government, "I want a guaranty of 6 percent. I am going to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning, and I will work hard all day. I am going to put in a crop. I want a guaranty from you that I will receive 6 percent net." If a farmer made such a request seriously he would be sent to the insane asylum on the ground that he was crazy for ever making it. Yet the steel companies, because they have a monopoly, because they can hold our Government up for almost anything, receive a rebate of 29 percent. Mr. Coffee said further:

Nowhere in the world, in any period of history, have comparable material gains been registered by industry. The war presumably has wiped out German and Japanese industry. Principal industries in Allied countries have suffered so heavily that it will take them a decade or more to regain even prewar production.

American business today is in the position of completely dominating world trade. It has become so strongly entrenched through its war profits that for many years it need fear no real competition anywhere on the globe.

Congress has not yet passed a comprehensive full-employment bill for the American people. But the tax-reduction bill has been rushed through in record time.

Yet, Mr. President, as I said yesterday, the Republican Party rushed through the tax-reduction program. They said that was a promise made during the campaign which had to be kept; but they did not

rush through bills to carry out the other pledges they had made in unequivocal language. They did not put through a bill providing for the establishment of the FEPC. They did not put through a bill to do away with the poll tax. They did not put through a single concrete piece of legislation against discrimination or segregation against Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, or the Negroes, not one.

Mr. Coffee, a former Representative in Congress, continues:

Congress has not yet passed a comprehensive full-employment bill for the American people. But the tax-reduction bill has been rushed through in record time. Principal provision of this bill eliminates the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946. The total cut in taxes is almost \$6,000,000,000, apportioned as follows between individuals and corporations:

Individuals.....	\$2,784,000,000
Corporations.....	3,136,000,000

The reduction in individual income taxes is overwhelmingly in favor of the larger income groups. The little man gets \$1 a year more to spend; the millionaire gets \$44,218 more.

The 900 largest corporations in this country will get a tax reduction averaging \$2,000,000 each in 1946. This amounts to a benefit twice that of the rest of the 18,000 corporations which have admitted excess profits. There is no gain whatever for the 261,000 smaller corporations that were never able to report excess profits.

At the same time it was revealed that the deficit in the national budget for 1946 is estimated at \$30,000,000,000.

All this, then, must go into the balance in which we weigh our victory. On one side we have the total cost of war: \$336,000,000,000 in cash, plus the dead, the wounded, the missing; on the other, the outright profits made by large corporations—some \$56,000,000,000 in cash, plus the power to dominate the lives of our people and the peoples of the world.

Someone may say that John M. Coffee may be wrong. Some may say that he is radical. Some may even claim that he was prejudiced. So I call upon other witnesses. I call upon the Comptroller General of the United States. Surely it will not be claimed that Lindsay Warren is an irresponsible public official. Let me read a few of the things that he said. This is from page A1664, volume 90, part 9, of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an extension of remarks of Hon. REID F. MURRAY, of Wisconsin. The following is from an article in the April 1, 1944, issue of Labor:

Warren insisted with great vehemence that every contract settlement should be audited. He cited huge payments already made by "officials who made the contracts sitting across the table from the contractors."

It was at this point that he declared that some of the officials were "just plain crooks, more interested in fattening the profits of contractors than in safeguarding the taxpayer."

"The tragedy is that no one seems disturbed about it," Warren said, explaining that when such matters are brought to public attention they are met with a "shrug of the shoulder and condoned under the specious plea that we have got a war to win."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, under the heading "We all know Lindsay Warren is a responsible public official," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

WE ALL KNOW LINDSAY WARREN IS A RESPONSIBLE PUBLIC OFFICIAL

(Extension of remarks of Hon. REID F. MURRAY, of Wisconsin, in the House of Representatives, Friday, March 31, 1944)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the April 1 issue of Labor indicates what is taking place during this war. Certain agencies are continually calling the attention of the public to the profits of farmers when their total average income is only \$3,000 to say nothing about the net income. The official study of Dr. Wylie Goodsell showed that a rather large percentage of the farmers of America made from 19 cents to 47 cents per hour in 1942.

Certain other groups and individuals that have accepted a 21.6 percent cost-of-living bonus on an overtime basis themselves on the first \$2,900 of their \$2,900 to \$15,000 Federal salaries at the same time have insisted on freezing the below-average-income groups with 40 to 50 cents per hour wage. They even protested the 15-percent advance in wages provided by the Little Steel formula, for this below-average-income group.

The article follows:

"PROFITEERS ARE GETTING AWAY WITH MURDER, WARREN SAYS—AIDED BY 'CROOKS AND THIEVES' IN GOVERNMENT, COMPTROLLER CHARGES—BLASTS COST-PLUS CONTRACTS AS 'DAMNABLE'"

"A Government official wearing the uniform of his country was arrested in New York recently with \$15,000 in marked bills in his pocket."

"That startling instance was recited by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, in testimony before the House Naval Affairs Committee this week as proof of his contention that Congress must keep a sharp eye on administration if war profiteers are not to bleed the taxpayers white.

"Some of these officials," he charged, "have been found to be just plain crooks and thieves. We have been assured that the bad and the inefficient have been weeded out, but that is just not so."

"Warren's statement was one of the most sensational yet made before a congressional committee—and that is saying a mouthful. He declared that profiteers 'are on the loose' and are milking Uncle Sam for all he is worth. 'Worse still,' he added, 'many are getting away with it.'

"Warren, before taking over the Comptroller job, was a Member of the House from North Carolina and was respected as a hard-working, conscientious, and extremely able conservative. The General Accounting Office, which he heads, was set up before the sorry experiences of the last war had grown cold, to check disbursements and to see that the Government got something like an even break in ordinary business dealings.

"GAO OUT OF PICTURE"

"As far as war contracts are concerned, however, the GAO is out of the picture, and will be kept out if bills now before Congress are approved. They provide for the settlement of the war claims virtually on the say-so of the contractors.

"Although billions of dollars are involved, the GAO is restricted to a mere comparison of the figures on vouchers and the amounts agreed upon by contractors and Government officials with whom settlements are made.

"It was to protest against this proposed set-up that Warren appeared before the committee, and he confronted a rather hostile audience. The committee seems to take the position that it is more important that contract settlements be made speedily than that the taxpayers shall be protected.

"BLASTS COST-PLUS PACTS"

"'Ruthless gouging,' Warren declared, 'is going on under cost-plus contracts,' which were branded as 'the most extravagant, the most vicious, and the most damnable form of business skullduggery.'

"Of course," he conceded, 'war itself is wasteful and large expenditures are to be expected, but that,' he contended, 'is no reason why ordinary prudence should be thrown to the winds. Even on the battlefields,' he emphasized, 'Army generals try to spare their men.'

"Like these generals," he asserted, 'the contracting officers of the Government should make an effort to spare the public's money. Every dollar spent should show a dollar's worth in return.'

"JUST PLAIN CROOKS"

"Warren insisted with great vehemence that every contract settlement should be audited. He cited huge payments already made by officials who made the contracts sitting across the table from the contractors."

"It was at this point he declared that some of the officials were 'just plain crooks, more interested in fattening the profits of contractors than in safeguarding the taxpayer.'

"The tragedy is that no one seems disturbed about it," Warren said, explaining that when such matters are brought to public attention they are met with a 'shrug of the shoulder and condoned under the specious plea that we have got a war to win.'

"LIKE OLIVER TWIST"

"Driving home the matter of laxity, Warren revealed that in cases where his office has had power to toss out illegal claims the contracts have been revised and the Government recovered large sums.

"If somebody would come to us and say the Government shouldn't pay for something, we would be the most surprised people in the world," Warren declared. "However, with the audacity of Oliver Twist, they come and say, 'Please, sir, we want more.'"

"Warren hasn't concluded his presentation. When he again appears before the committee he promises to give chapter and verse details of how Uncle Sam is being hornswoggled on both sides of the bargaining table."

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me so that I may submit a conference report, which I think can be disposed of without controversy? It relates to the World Health Organization.

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the World Health Organization (hereinafter referred to as the Organization), the constitution of which was adopted in New York on July 22, 1946, by the International Health Conference for the establishment of an International Health Organization, and

deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

"Sec. 2. The President shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the World Health Assembly of the Organization not to exceed three delegates of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the World Health Assembly. One of the delegates shall be designated as the chief delegate. Whenever the United States becomes entitled to designate a person to serve on the Executive Board of the Organization, under article 24 of the constitution of the Organization, the President shall designate a representative of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and may designate not to exceed one alternate to attend sessions of the Executive Board. Such representative must be a graduate of a recognized medical school and have spent not less than three years in active practice as a physician or surgeon. Such representative shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$12,000 per annum and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$10,000 per annum for such period or periods as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is thus designated shall be entitled to receive such compensation: *Provided*, That no person shall serve as such representative, delegate, or alternate until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

"(a) such sums, not to exceed \$1,920,000 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, including those incurred by the Interim Commission, as apportioned by the Health Assembly in accordance with Article 56 of the Constitution of the Organization; and

"(b) such additional sums, not to exceed \$83,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

"(1) salaries of the representatives and alternate provided for in section 2 hereof, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

"(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

"Sec. 4. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the understanding that, in the absence of any provision in the World Health Organization Constitution for withdrawal from the Organization, the United States reserves its right to withdraw from the Organization on a one-year notice:

Provided, however, That the financial obligations of the United States to the Organization shall be met in full for the Organization's current fiscal year.

"SEC. 5. In adopting this joint resolution, the Congress does so with the understanding that nothing in the Constitution of the World Health Organization in any manner commits the United States to enact any specific legislative program regarding any matters referred to in said Constitution."

And the House agree to the same.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
TOM CONNALLY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
WALTER H. JUDD,
WIRT COURTNEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think it is sufficient to say that the joint resolution is in the precise form in which it originally passed the Senate, except that certain precautions have been added, one of which is a ceiling upon any appropriations that can be made, and another requiring FBI inquiry into the qualifications of American employees. Otherwise, I think it is substantially the same as in the form passed by the Senate. I ask for approval of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE— INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am informed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that for 3 days he has been waiting to obtain the floor. I know that to be a fact because I have talked with him. I know that 3 days ago he was trying to obtain the floor. I am, therefore, yielding the floor so that he may be recognized, and I ask unanimous consent that the speech which I have made on my amendment shall not prejudice my speaking again on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I respectfully suggest that the able Senator from North Dakota continue and complete his remarks on this subject, so that we may proceed in some order. The hour is growing late. We have before us perhaps the most important bill which will be before this Congress. The Senator

has had ample time, and under the rules of the Senate, he still has ample time to discuss the merits of the selective service bill. However, I respectfully suggest that he continue until he has completed his remarks. Then the Senator from Georgia may obtain the floor in his own right. I think I shall have to object to recognition of the Senator from Georgia with the unanimous consent understanding that the Senator from North Dakota may be recognized again.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the objection, I will say to my distinguished colleague from Georgia that I am very sorry. I did the best I could for him. He can now take a rest, because I intend to speak for a least an hour, or perhaps 2 hours more, in view of the objection. I tried to obtain unanimous consent, and was unable to get it.

My amendment is of great importance. I know that the Senator from Georgia has been waiting for 3 days for recognition. I am deeply sorry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. It is far from my purpose to prevent the Senator from North Dakota from fully covering the subject.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now call upon another great statesman who is no longer with us, a man who was formerly a Member of the Senate, David I. Walsh. Mr. Walsh was a distinguished Member of this body. On May 10, 1944, Mr. Walsh had a certain article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article had been printed in the University of Chicago Law Review. The article is entitled "War Profits and Legislative Policy." Mr. Walsh had been Governor of the great State of Massachusetts. He had been reelected Governor. Three different times he had been elected to the United States Senate from the State of Massachusetts. I almost forgot to mention that he was also lieutenant governor of that State for a while.

Here is what the great Senator Walsh of Massachusetts said in an article that was prepared by him for the University of Chicago Law Review:

WAR PROFITS AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY

(By David I. Walsh, United States Senator from Massachusetts)

Just as inveighing against sin is spasmodically a popular pastime, so, too, is inveighing against war profiteering. With the latter, considerable success has been experienced in the last 2 years, and it seems doubtful that, as a result of this success, postwar investigations will reveal anything like the scandals which shocked the public during the two decades following World War I.

Mr. President, I mention that to show that regardless of whether it is World War I or World War II, the pattern of robbing the common people is the same. Even during the Civil War, when Abraham Lincoln advertised for muskets and for horses, what the Army got was worn-out muskets and spavined horses. As a result, the Congress passed the Informers Act. That act provided that if there was a conspiracy to defraud the United States Government and if anyone in the conspiracy informed against his fellow conspirators, the men who were guilty would be fined double the amount they had stolen from the Government or had de-

frauded the Government; and of the money which the Government recovered, the informer would receive one-half and the Government the other half. The act also provided that in addition to putting the guilty persons in jail, the Government could also get \$2,000 for every criminal offense. So even in the Civil War there were sharks and ghouls and war profiteers robbing the common people.

So as Senator David Walsh said in the article, there was war profiteering in World War I.

I read further from the article he wrote:

From its earliest days this country has been confronted with attempts on the part of merchants and vendors "to avail themselves of the difficulties of the times, and to amass fortunes on the public ruin." A condition which our people have faced in every one of their wars—and which other people have faced in their own wars—is perhaps best described by the Father of his Country in a letter dated March 31, 1779. It is worth quoting in extenso:

Mr. President, here we have the testimony of George Washington. If my amendment is adopted, it will limit the amount of profits to 10 percent, which I say is enough. Here is what George Washington said about this matter—and this letter was written by him on March 31, 1779:

Our conflict is not likely to cease so soon as every good man would wish. The measure of iniquity is not yet filled. * * *

Speculation, speculation, production, engrossing, forestalling * * * affording too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public virtue * * * and too glaring instances of its being the interest and desire of too many who wish to be thought friends, to continue the war.

Mr. President, Washington said those men were willing to continue the war in order to keep on making war profits—just as Henry Wallace said, when he was testifying before the Senate committee, that there were men trying to scare the Congress and trying to scare the people of the United States, when there was not one single substantial piece of evidence or proof that the national security of the country was in any danger at all.

Mr. President, I repeat, that I challenge any member of the committee who heard that testimony to show one scintilla of evidence that the national security is in danger. As Mr. Wallace says, these men go around scaring people. They are hypnotists who instill fear. I continue to read the statement by George Washington:

Cannot this common country America possess virtue enough to disappoint them? Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation, and of millions yet unborn?

Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure? And shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust for gain?

Forbid it, heaven! Forbid it, all and every State in the Union! By enacting and enforcing efficacious laws for checking the growth of these monstrous evils, and restoring matters, in some degree to the pristine

state they were in at the commencement of the war.

Our cause is noble; it is the cause of mankind. And the danger to it is to be apprehended from ourselves. (George Washington, in a letter to the President of Congress, dated August 16, 1777.)

Then the article by Senator Walsh continues:

The hopelessness of General Washington's position, his impotence to cure or even deal with "speculation, speculation, production, engrossing, forestalling," is akin to the difficulties which he had in maintaining his armed forces, whose personnel was wont to take off for home on the slightest whim.

This letter is worth quoting because it indicates the extent to which our groping for a solution to the problem of curbing war profiteering has advanced. In each of our wars adventurers have sought "to amass fortunes upon the public ruin." But in the present war such attempts are being dealt with effectively.

The problem is threefold—material, fiscal, and moral—with political overtones. Adequate appreciation of this triple nature of the problem is essential to an understanding of the history of attempts to meet it. For if attention is paid to the tone of only one or only two times of the tuning fork, the results may be highly discordant.

PRICE OF ARMOR PLATE IN SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The most important of the threefold aspects of the problem is the material. For to an increasing extent wars have become matters of matériel. The point is illustrated by attempts by the Congress to control the price of just one item of matériel—armor plate—prior to and during the Spanish-American War. During the early nineties the Navy had paid from \$574 to as high as \$671 for armor plate.² In the belief that such prices were unreasonable, the Congress took action, and on March 3, 1897, a statute limiting the price of armor plate to \$300 a ton was approved. Fiscal and moral considerations may have motivated such action, but that material considerations were not amply weighed is indicated by the ineffectiveness of this legislation. Manufacturers simply refused to accept contracts at the lower price. To avoid its having dire results in the prosecution of the war, the Congress had to raise the ceiling to \$400. Notwithstanding this experience, the Congress subsequently tempted fate by reducing the ceiling once more to \$300, with the result that manufacturers again refused to bid. Finally despairing, the Congress gave the Secretary of the Navy authority to procure armor "at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable." Thus, the Congress finally succumbed to the material aspect of the problem—the most important of the three.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article entitled "War Profits and Legislative Policy," by the late David I. Walsh, former United States Senator from Massachusetts.

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

WAR PROFITS AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY

(Extension of remarks of Hon. David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, May 10, (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944)

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me entitled "War Profits and Legislative Policy," from the University of Chicago Law Review for April 1944.

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

"WAR PROFITS AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY"

"(By David I. Walsh, United States Senator from Massachusetts)

"Just as inveighing against sin is spasmodically a popular pastime, so, too, is inveighing against war profiteering. With the latter, considerable success has been experienced in the last 2 years, and it seems doubtful that, as a result of this success, postwar investigations will reveal anything like the scandals which shocked the public during the two decades following World War No. 1.

"From its earliest days this country has been confronted with attempts on the part of merchants and vendors to avail themselves of the difficulties of the times, and to amass fortunes on the public ruin.¹ A condition which our people have faced in every one of their wars—and which other people have faced in their own wars—is perhaps best described by the Father of his Country in a letter dated March 31, 1779. It is worth quoting in extenso:

"Our conflict is not likely to cease so soon as every good man would wish. The measure of iniquity is not yet filled. * * *

"Speculation, speculation, production, engrossing, forestalling * * * affording too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public virtue * * * and too glaring instances of its being the interest and desire of too many who wish to be thought friends, to continue the war. * * *

"'Cannot this common country, America, possess virtue enough to disappoint them? Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation, and of millions yet unborn?'

"'Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure? And shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust for gain?'

"'Forbid it heaven! Forbid it all and every State in the Union! By enacting and enforcing efficacious laws for checking the growth of these monstrous evils, and restoring matters, in some degree to the pristine state they were in at the commencement of the war.

"'Our cause is noble, it is the cause of mankind. And the danger to it is to be apprehended from ourselves.'

"The hopelessness of General Washington's position, his impotence to cure or even deal with 'speculation, speculation, production, engrossing, forestalling,' is akin to the difficulties which he had in maintaining his armed forces, whose personnel was wont to take off for home on the slightest whim.

"This letter is worth quoting because it indicates the extent to which our groping for a solution to the problem of curbing war profiteering has advanced. In each of our wars adventurers have sought 'to amass fortunes upon the public ruin.' But in the present war such attempts are being dealt with effectively.

"The problem is threefold—material, fiscal, and moral—with political overtones. Adequate appreciation of this triple nature of the problem is essential to an understanding of the history of attempts to meet it. For if attention is paid to the tone of only one or only two times of the tuning fork, the results may be highly discordant.

"PRICE OF ARMOR PLATE IN SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR"

"The most important of the threefold aspects of the problem is the material. For

¹ George Washington, in a letter to the President of Congress dated August 16, 1777.

to an increasing extent wars have become matters of matériel. The point is illustrated by attempts by the Congress to control the price of just one item of matériel—armor plate—prior to and during the Spanish-American War. During the early nineties the Navy had paid from \$574 to as high as \$671 for armor plate.² In the belief that such prices were unreasonable, the Congress took action, and on March 3, 1897, a statute limiting the price of armor plate to \$300 a ton was approved. Fiscal and moral considerations may have motivated such action, but that material considerations were not amply weighed is indicated by the ineffectiveness of this legislation. Manufacturers simply refused to accept contracts at the lower price. To avoid its having dire results in the prosecution of the war, the Congress had to raise the ceiling to \$400. Notwithstanding this experience, the Congress subsequently tempted fate by reducing the ceiling once more to \$300, with the result that manufacturers again refused to bid.³ Finally despairing, the Congress gave the Secretary of the Navy authority 'to procure armor 'at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable.' Thus, the Congress finally succumbed to the material aspect of the problem—the most important of the three.

"Price and profit control must be so finely governed that the material requirements of a war will be satisfied. This means that, under the capitalistic system to which we are committed, there must be incentive to produce and to produce quickly in large volume. In peacetime, competition provides this incentive, and as soon as competition kills it, production ceases. The fittest survive. But in wartime the production of the least fit may be just as essential as the production of the fittest, so that prices and profits must be such that both have an incentive to survive. If the material aspects of the problem are not given sufficient weight, the question of the moral and fiscal aspects may become academic through the loss of the war which is being fought.

"PRICE AND PROFIT CONTROLS IN WORLD WAR I"

"Attempts to control prices and profits of war contracts in World War I proved futile. Indeed, as in the case of the Spanish-American War, they boomeranged—but for a different reason. The material aspect of the problem was overemphasized by the adoption of cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts. These were designed to underwrite the contractors, inducing him to turn to war production because by such underwriting he escaped risk, and at the same time inducing him to produce rapidly in large volume. But by the very nature of these contracts, he was actually induced to increase his costs, for the ratio between profits and costs remained constant and the higher the dollar costs the higher the dollar profits. Thus, a fiscal fallacy entered into the adoption of this kind of a contractual arrangement. It should have been evident at the outset, but in this as in so many aspects of pricing, hindsight is superior to foresight.

"Another fiscal error was made when attempts to limit war profits were supplemented by relatively high excess-profits taxes.⁴

² Hensel and McClung, Profit Limitation Controls Prior to the Present War, 10 LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS 187 at 191 (1943).

³ Long, 1 THE NEW AMERICAN NAVY 46 et seq. (1903).

⁴ Act of June 7, 1900, 81 Stat. 684, 707; H. R. Doc. No. 95, 55th Cong., 2d sess.; 31 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 934 (1898), 32 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2190-2191 (1899); report of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, attached to report of the Secretary of Navy (1905), 45-47.

⁵ Revenue Act of Sept. 8, 1916, 39 Stat. 756, 780; Revenue Act of Mar. 3, 1917, 39 Stat. 1000; and Revenue Act of 1918, 40 Stat. 1057.

"As Bernard Baruch has stated,⁶ high excess-profits taxes standing alone aggravate war evils.

"However lofty may have been the motives of the country, the Congress, and the procurement agencies during World War I, however much they may have had their eyes on the material and moral prongs of the tuning fork, they failed to tune in with the third—the fiscal. While, unlike the experience of the Spanish-American War, legislation did not in itself hamper satisfaction of the material considerations or discourage production, while attempts to limit profits satisfied lofty moral concepts, these attempts were abortive because insufficient attention was given to the fiscal aspect of the problem. Not only did cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts fail to curb war profiteering; they aggravated it. Not only did high excess-profits taxes fail to prevent war profiteering; they made for inflation.

"Of the 168 bills and resolutions introduced into the Congress between the 1918 armistice and the fall of France for the purpose of coping with the problem of war profiteering, few were adopted and none recognized the threefold nature of the problem. Of those that were adopted, all were failures because they considered only the moral aspect of the problem. The only important piece of legislation of this nature was incorporated in the Vinson-Trammell Act, passed in 1934⁷ and subsequently amended three times—in 1936,⁸ 1939,⁹ and 1940.¹⁰ By limiting profits on naval vessels (subsequently extended to apply to military and naval aircraft) to a percentage of the contract price, the Vinson-Trammell Act prescribed what, in effect, was not very alien to the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts of World War No. 1. The main difference was that the contract price rather than the cost was the base. While superficially this difference might appear to be great, in actual practice, it could be almost meaningless. Thus, because it did not give sufficient cognizance to the material and fiscal aspects of price control and profit limitation on war contracts, the Vinson-Trammell Act was ineffectual. More than that, in some instances the act discouraged shipbuilders and aircraft manufacturers from entering into contracts, and thus delayed the defense program.¹¹

"POLITICAL OVERTONES

"During the twenties, the question of regulation of prices of war contracts and limitation of profits thereon became increasingly important from the political standpoint.

"One of the most potent forces was the American Legion, whose political influence was growing rapidly. In 1920 it launched a campaign for what it termed 'Universal service.'¹²

"In 1924 the two major political parties each included a plank calling for the close control of the munitions industry in time of war.

⁶ American Industry and the War 415 (1921).

⁷ 48 Stat. 505 (1934), 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 496.

⁸ 49 Stat. 1926 (1936), 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 1155.

⁹ 53 Stat. 555 (1939), par. 14, 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 496.

¹⁰ 54 Stat. 676 (1940), 41 U. S. C. 1940 ed., note preceding paragraph 1.

¹¹ See debate on 1940 Excess Profits Tax, 87 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11,243, August 29, 1940.

¹² This was a 3-way program designed to: (1) Promote peace, (2) take the profits out of war, and (3) strengthen the national defense." Note that the American Legion's second point was to "take the profits out of war"—not some of the profits, but by implication, all of the profits.

"The Republican plank¹³ read as follows:

"We believe that in time of war the Nation should draft for its defenses not only its citizens but also every resource which may contribute to success. The country demands that should the United States ever again be called upon to defend itself by arms, the President be empowered to draft such material resources and such services as may be required, and to stabilize prices of services and essential commodities, whether utilized in actual warfare or private activity."

"The Democratic plank¹⁴ read as follows:

"In the event of war in which the manpower of the Nation is drafted, all other resources should likewise be drafted. This will tend to discourage war by depriving it of its profits."

"Apparently both major political parties felt that with the adoption of these two planks in 1924 the matter had been disposed of, for future party platforms ignored the subject. In view of the extensive newspaper publicity and general public preoccupation with the question of control of war profits that developed as the years went on, it seems strange that neither political party made an issue of the matter. Nor is it reasonable to explain this omission of the question from the party platforms by the fact that it was receiving so much attention in the Congress. The omission may be set down simply as a political phenomenon.

"During the 1930's, with World War II drawing nearer, agitation for a complete ban on war profits grew apace. Thus, a majority of the Senate Munitions Committee on June 18, 1936, recommended the nationalization of naval shipbuilding and manufacture of certain arms used by the Army and Navy.¹⁵ The minority report of the committee expressed the belief that rigid and conclusive munitions control would be more effective than nationalization in promoting peace, defense, and economy. The majority recommendation was based on the conclusion, drawn from 2 years of investigation, that regulation of arms manufacture is easily evaded.¹⁶

"On June 22, 1936, the women's committee on suggestions for the Democratic platform recommended by unanimous adoption that the best way to preserve peace was by passing stronger neutrality legislation and taxing the profit out of war.¹⁷

"Three months earlier, in one of the first polls conducted by Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, the people of the country had gone on record as strongly favoring manufacture by the Government of its own war materials. In the Nation-wide poll the vote favoring this change was 82 to 18 out of every 100, with about the same proportion of members of both political parties favoring the change.¹⁸

"It was this agitation that, in part, led to the strengthening of the Vinson-Trammell Act of June 27, 1936.¹⁹

"The political crescendo reached in regard to war-profits control occurred in 1939 and 1940 and 25 bills were introduced in the Congress to deal with the subject more effectively than it had been dealt with theretofore. With war brewing and finally developing in Europe and with production of munitions mounting rapidly in this country, it was only natural that insistence upon adoption

¹³ See Republican Campaign Text Book of 1924 at 85.

¹⁴ See Democratic Campaign Text Book of 1924 at 39.

¹⁵ Baltimore Sun, June 20, 1936, Associated Press dispatch from Washington.

¹⁶ Supra, note 15.

¹⁷ Philadelphia Record, June 23, 1936.

¹⁸ The National Weekly Poll of Public Opinion, March 7, 1936.

¹⁹ 49 Stat. 1936, 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 296.

of some form of control should increase. None of these numerous bills, however, was adopted, for the Congress was tending more and more to the belief that the problem could be dealt with by a high excess-profits tax.

"Still clearly uncertain as to how to cope with the problem, the Congress side-stepped the issue in the Revenue Act of 1940. Finally, however, on July 1, 1940, shortly after approval of the Revenue Act of 1940, the President addressed a strong message to the Congress directing its attention to the national defense program and to the duty of the Congress to see that the burden of the program was equitably distributed according to ability to pay, and recommending the enactment of a steeply graduated excess-profits tax, to be applied to all individuals and all corporate organizations without discrimination.²⁰

"As a result, both Houses finally adopted a highly complicated measure involving a combination of the theories of average earnings and invested capital which represented a not very happy compromise.²¹ The provisions for excess-profits taxes were subsequently amended in 1941²² and again in 1942.²³

"SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT

"An uneasy feeling that the high excess-profits taxes did not wholly accomplish the purpose of controlling prices and profits on war production continued to prevail in the Congress. During discussion of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of April 1942, Congressman FRANCIS CASE, Republican, from South Dakota, introduced into the House a measure to limit the profits on war contracts to 6 percent.²⁴ While it was not specifically stated, it is to be presumed that this 6 percent was on a basis of before taxes, following the precedent established by the Vinson-Trammell Act. The measure passed the House by a vote of 70 to 8.²⁵

"As it went to the Senate, however, the procurement agencies along with the War Production Board pointed out that this arrangement would place a profit strait-jacket on business and provide for the realization of excessive profits by companies which in the best of peacetimes were accustomed to making no more than 2 percent on sales, while at the same time it might force heavy industry companies into bankruptcy by not allowing them sufficient return. In other words, while the aim of the Case amendment was laudable, again the question of practicality was overlooked.

"Meanwhile, recognizing that unprecedented volume of production was leading to excessive profits already indicated by 1941 corporate reports, the War Department had conducted a number of price renegotiations with prominent war contractors. Therefore, when asked by the Congress to suggest an alternative to the Case amendment, Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Chief of the Army Service Forces, presented a substitute on behalf of the procurement agencies. It was based on

²⁰ H. Rept. No. 2697, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (June 30, 1940), a conference report on H. R. 10039. The bill was enacted into the Internal Revenue Code, 54 Stat. 516, 26 U. S. C., 1940 ed., pars 12 et seq.

²¹ H. Rept. No. 3002, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (Sept. 30, 1940), a conference report on H. R. 10413, which was enacted into the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1940 (Oct. 8, 1940), 54 Stat. 974, 975 ff., 26 U. S. C., 1940 ed., pars. 710 ff.

²² 55 Stat. 17 (1941), incorporated into Internal Revenue Code, 26 U. S. C., par. 710 (Supp. 1941).

²³ 56 Stat. 798, act of Oct. 21, 1942, Public Law 753, 77th Cong., 2d sess.

²⁴ 88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 28, 1942, p. 3230.

²⁵ Ibid. at 3231.

the theory that if every contract price could be reexamined by the parties in the light of actual experience under the contract, it should be possible to eliminate the bulk of excessive profits.²⁶

"Appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, gave the following reasons for opposing a set profit limitation:

"1. Effect of costs: In our view, the control of profits is an integral part of the problem of controlling costs and prices, and any method must be evaluated by its effects on all three aspects. From this point of view we feel that renegotiation is far superior to a fixed percentage limitation.

"2. Uniformity: In the second place, a flat percentage limitation does not really achieve its prime objective of uniformity of treatment. Although it allows a fixed uniform percent of profit on gross sales, this will be most unfair as applied to the diverse types of business engaged in war work. It takes no account of the fact that in different lines of business the same volume of sales may require widely different amounts of capital, skill, and work, depending on the rate of turn-over."²⁷

"This can be regarded as a perfect summation of the practical aspects of control of prices on and profits from war contractors.

"As for political aspects, the startling revelations as to extraordinary salaries and bonuses paid by Jack & Heintz, Inc., as brought out in hearings before the Naval Affairs Investigating Committee,²⁸ crystallized in the public mind the extent to which war profiteering might lead. Public reaction, as reflected in newspaper comment and letters to the Congress, was immediate and intense. Under the leadership of Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democrat of Tennessee, the Senate Appropriations Committee adopted the principle of contract renegotiation in the form of section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act.²⁹ Thus, politically, this final approach to control of war profiteering had its active sponsorship from a Republican in the House and a Democrat in the Senate. The 1924 party platforms had been fulfilled.

"ANTIRENEGOTIATION CAMPAIGN"

"But the matter had not been fully resolved with enactment of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act and its section 403. Perhaps because there had been no debate in the Senate or the House on this section, some contractors subject to it took the position that it had been ill-considered and that it was designed to ruin American business.

"In August of 1942 the campaign to repeal or emasculate renegotiation was launched by John B. Hawley, president and sole owner of the Northern Pump Co., of Minnesota, when he circularized the Congress and businessmen with a silver-covered 42-page brochure captioned 'Dictatorship over United States Industry under Public Law 528' and subtitled 'Sabotage of production, development, and expansion—Towards losing the war.' This was only one of a series of mailings sent out by one of the relatively few aggressive opponents of renegotiation—an excellent producer, it must be said, as are most of the other vocal business opponents. At about the same time a financial magazine carried an article by a prominent writer con-

demning renegotiation and basing his argument almost wholly on a theoretical case coinciding interestingly with Northern Pump.³⁰ This article, displaying a wide misconception of what renegotiation is all about, was subsequently reprinted in condensed form in Reader's Digest. The battle was on.

"The departments engaged in renegotiation agreed with some of the more reasoned objections to the law which were voiced by businessmen of a less sensational stripe than Hawley, Jack, et al. Indeed, as the administrators began to work with the act, it became apparent that it did contain a number of minor flaws relating chiefly to mechanics. This was inevitable, since adoption and application of the principle of renegotiation represented pioneering. Certain recommendations for changes in renegotiation were adopted administratively by the departments and subsequently incorporated as amendments to section 403 in the Revenue Act of 1942,³¹ jurisdiction for renegotiation having been transferred from the Appropriations Committee to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, where it has continued to remain.

"A summary of some of the other changes effected through the Revenue Act of 1942 will indicate the manner in which the practical aspects of profit control were now commanding an increasing degree of attention—the moral, fiscal, and political aspects having been satisfied by the adoption of the principle embodied in section 403.

"One amendment provided for final agreements. When a contractor or subcontractor renegotiated in good faith for a specified period and agreed to eliminate excessive profits for that period, it was clear that he should be entitled to assurance that the matter would not be reopened at a later date. The original statute did not provide expressly for any final clearance for liability for excessive profits. This amendment specifically authorized such final agreements for a specified past or future period.

"Another change was embodied in two provisions affecting a statute of limitations on renegotiation. The first of these prohibited renegotiation after 1 year from the close of the fiscal year in which the contract or subcontract was completed or terminated. The second authorized a contractor to file financial and cost statements for prior fiscal periods and obtain clearance under the statute, unless the Secretary should begin renegotiation within 1 year thereafter. Few contractors availed themselves of this privilege.

"Under the original law, when a contractor or subcontractor held a number of war contracts or subcontracts, the boards had found it desirable to renegotiate with him to eliminate excessive profits on these contracts or subcontracts as a group, or on an over-all basis, instead of individually. Section 403 authorized renegotiation of contracts individually. In view of the boards' practice of considering contracts as a group, the group renegotiation was formalized as part of the statute.

"By one of the amendments, too, the Treasury Department was brought into the field of renegotiation, while other changes were largely of a technical and relatively minor nature.

"CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS"

"Politically, the next important step affecting renegotiation was an investigation by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program (Truman committee) begun in the early part of 1943 under the direction of Senator CARL M. HATCH, chairman of a special subcommittee on renegotia-

tion. A report³² issued by this subcommittee under date of March 30, 1943, in general, endorsed the principle of renegotiation in no uncertain terms, praised its administration, and made a number of recommendations designed to lead to further improvement in both the act and the administration.

"Led by a small minority of businessmen, the attack on the principle of renegotiation became increasingly vocal as the year 1943 progressed. Thus it was that several score of industrialists thoroughly opposed to renegotiation appeared before the Naval Affairs investigation committee during its hearings on the subject in June 1943.³³ Also before this committee, on the other hand, appeared a number of contractors who favored the principle and the administration of the renegotiation statute. The transcript of these hearings is embodied in a 1,300-page document, which was supplemented on October 7, 1943, by a report of the committee itself.³⁴ The majority of this committee followed in the steps of the Truman committee by strongly endorsing both the principle and the administration of the statute. The minority endorsed the principle, praised the Government representatives in the price adjustment boards, but averred that renegotiation had served its purpose and should be repealed as to contracts made after December 31, 1943.

"With attacks by certain business groups rising to a higher pitch, the House Ways and Means Committee—as part of its job in preparing the revenue bill of 1943—began hearings on renegotiation in September 1943, which continued off and on during the month. This testimony ran 1,100 pages.³⁵ The committee's report³⁶ outlined provisions for a new renegotiation act based on section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act. To the amazement of business interests, the renegotiation provisions prescribed by the House Ways and Means Committee continued renegotiation in the main as it had been conducted for nearly a year and a half. Major changes—including provision for court review of unilateral determinations and exemption of contractors having renegotiable business less than \$500,000 a year—had been either recommended or endorsed by the administrative departments.

"When the Senate Finance Committee had completed its hearings on renegotiation early in December of 1943, however, it soon became apparent that the majority of the committee was determined to make such changes in the House bill as would leave only an empty shell. The form would be preserved but the substance destroyed. All over the country newspapers reflected the public reaction to this attempted emasculation. Such a cham-

²⁶ Additional report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program pursuant to S. Res. 71 ((77th Cong.)), a resolution authorizing and directing an investigation of the national defense program, renegotiation of war contracts, March 30 (legislative day, March 23), 1943.

²⁷ Investigation of the Progress of the War Effort; hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 1st sess. (Renegotiation of War Contracts, vol. 2, June 10 through June 30, 1943.)

²⁸ Investigation of the Progress of the War Effort, report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, Renegotiation of War Contracts, October 7, 1943.

²⁹ Renegotiation of war contracts, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015, revised, September 9 through 23, 1943.

³⁰ The revenue bill of 1943, November 18, 1943, 78th Cong., 1st sess., House of Representatives Report No. 871.

²⁶ Brig. Gen. Albert J. Browning, Price Control and Renegotiation, 29 Cornell L. Q. 149 at 165 (1943).

²⁷ See testimony of Under Secretary of War Patterson at hearings before Senate Finance Subcommittee on sec. 403 of Public Law No. 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess. (1942) 3.

²⁸ Hearings before House Naval Affairs Committee on H. Res. No. 162 (vol. I; Mar. 28, 1942) 77th Cong., 2d sess.

²⁹ Public Law No. 528, sec. 403, 56 Stat. 245, 50 U. S. C., par. 1191 (Supp. 1942).

³⁰ John T. Flynn in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly for Aug. 31, 1942, Cost Plus, a World War Evil Returns.

³¹ Act of Oct. 21, 1942, Public Law No. 753, 56 Stat. 798.

pion of private enterprise as David Lawrence at one extreme and such a leftist as PM at the other extreme, sprang to the defense of renegotiation. Said the former:

"Undoubtedly there have been some injustices, and these ought to be revised by the tax court, or even some special court. But when a man like James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, whose peacetime job is investment banking in Wall Street, cries out against the efforts to emasculate the renegotiation law, other businessmen will want to ask themselves whether their tactics may not lead to a reaction and another wave of radicalism and antibusiness legislation when the servicemen come back home and get all the facts about wartime profits."³⁷

"Another advocate of private enterprise, Mr. Arthur Krock, in commenting on the attempt to amend the renegotiation out of existence, said:

"If the Renegotiation Act is amended to the extent favored by the congressional committees, war corporate profits will reach levels that, when spotlighted after the war, as they are sure to be, may infuriate the country, produce a reckless and destructive backswing against industry and start all over again the cycle of pacifism and 'merchants-of-death' propaganda that helped so profoundly to send this Nation unprepared into desperate war."³⁸

"The preservation of private enterprise is certainly one of my chief concerns. Any legislation that would destroy or hurt it would be inimical to such a concern. Believing that renegotiation was not only in the general public interest but was of specific benefit to industry itself and convinced that any emasculation of renegotiation would be a serious blow to both the country as a whole and industry as an important segment, I presented on behalf of myself and Senators La Follette, Connally, and Lucas a document called Minority Views.³⁹ The response to publication of these views, which attacked certain of the provisions of the Senate bill that seemed to me to emasculate renegotiation, was instantaneous and dramatic. Newspaper editorial writers and commentators throughout the country, presumably reflecting a good cross section of public sentiment, made it clear that the public would not stand for renegotiation emasculation. It became crystal-clear that the country would not tolerate a return to World War I profiteering and that it regarded renegotiation as the only sound preventive measure so far developed.

"As a consequence, the Senate and House conferees, composing their differences, presented to the Congress what the Washington Post described as 'a testimonial to the legislative process of study, discussion, and compromise. It is,' continued the Post, 'a sound, workable law, acceptable to the executive agencies which much administer it and responsive to the rights of the contractors who must submit to it.'⁴⁰

"In short, after long trial and error, the fundamental trio of considerations, material, fiscal, and moral, had been satisfied by successful legislative processes for the reasonable control of wartime profiteering.

"No doubt, as time goes on, new flaws will appear in both the legislation and the administration. But as it now stands, the Renegotiation Act itself is the best solution of a difficult problem which human ingenuity and experience have been able to contrive."

³⁷ Washington Star, December 14, 1943.

³⁸ How Business Can Make Itself the Post-war Goat, Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, December 16, 1943.

³⁹ The revenue bill of 1943, Minority Views, January 6, 1944, 78th Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. 627, pt. 2.

⁴⁰ Washington Post, February 15, 1944, editorial page.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, dealing further with my amendment to limit war profits to 10 percent, I refer back to the fact that on the 9th day of May 1944 I made a speech upon the floor of the Senate on that very subject entitled "More Evidence of Huge Profiteering." It is one of many speeches I delivered on the subject. I read:

Few issues are of more vital importance than taxes. The fairness with which they are levied and the effectiveness with which they are collected may make or break a nation.

As everyone familiar with the situation knows, our tax laws are full of loopholes through which wealthy individuals and corporations are escaping their fair share of the cost of government.

As between Congress and the executive department, we do not attempt to assess responsibility for this situation. Both must share the blame. That is abundantly demonstrated by shocking disclosures in two official reports made public recently.

According to Randolph E. Paul, general counsel of the Treasury, the tax laws provide a postwar windfall for business that may reach the staggering figure of forty-five and one-half billion dollars, even if the war ends this week. The total will be larger if the conflicts extends beyond that period.

Before entering Government service Paul accumulated a good-sized fortune as tax adviser to business concerns. He can't be accused of radicalism or prejudice against business.

Tax legislation enacted in 1940, Paul pointed out in a speech before a gathering of businessmen at New York, permits business to obtain a refund of taxes paid during the war to meet the cost of conversion to peace—a subsidy in the guise of tax relief is the way he describes it.

For 2 years after the shooting stops—

Listen to this, Mr. President. Compare it with a farmer or a laboring man or a white-collar worker employed in a store on a salary. Compare what happens here with what happens to one of those men:

For 2 years after the shooting stops, if their factories do not turn a wheel, industrialists are assured of profits at least equal to their prewar earnings. Paul fears they may get more by inflating their costs and losses.

For all its generosity, this provision does not satisfy certain business groups. They insist that wartime taxes be returned to them now and retained in their own treasuries. They plead they can lay nothing aside for postwar readjustment. Paul exploded that statement.

He pointed out that, after paying taxes and all other charges, corporation profits during 1943 and 1944 alone will be three times average profits, after taxes, during the period from 1936 to 1939, inclusive. Furthermore, he emphasized, these corporations—after paying taxes and dividends and greatly increasing the salaries of their officials—have already accumulated from their war profits more than twelve billions of undistributed profits.

If we add the tax refunds to the undistributed profits, we will find these big concerns will have a postwar nest egg of \$57,500,000,000—or 30 percent more than the entire national income during the last year of the Hoover administration.

That is what I said 4 years ago. Senators told us that a great many people had robbed the Government. What good does it do to talk about it after the Government has lost the money? I have an amendment which I have submitted

providing that under the pending legislation no one dealing with the Government shall receive more than 10 percent profit.

On that same day I said:

Additional light on the fantastic profits of war contractors was furnished a few days ago by the Truman committee, which for 2 years has been investigating various phases of the war program.

Mr. President, we had the Truman committee in 1942. We have had investigation after investigation. Nobody ever seems to go to jail. The money of which the Government was robbed is gone. I repeat, no one seems to go to jail now any more than under the Sherman antitrust law, under which for 57 years not one single person has been sent to jail. When somebody robs the Government, we merely have another investigation. We find, somehow or other, that the action is outlawed, or else the criminal is dead and his descendants have the money.

I said at that time that the bulk of war business had been given to 100 corporations. Of these 100 the Truman committee asserted only 9 had been free of excess profits in 1942. As for the remainder, the profits ranged all the way from 25 to 600 times normal peacetime profits.

Mr. President, in order to give the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] an opportunity to speak, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the remainder of the speech which I delivered in May 1944 upon this subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object. Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the kindness of the Senator from North Dakota, but I prefer not to address the Senate until the pending amendment has been disposed of, unless unanimous consent be obtained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois made objection.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the objection of the distinguished acting minority leader, I shall continue speaking with reference to my amendment.

I want the RECORD to show, Mr. President, that I twice tried to conclude my remarks and give the Senator from Georgia an opportunity to deliver his speech, and twice I was prevented by objection. So I shall continue speaking with regard to my amendment.

In order that Senators who have come in late may know exactly what the amendment provides, I shall read it:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

On page 65, line 4, after the word "compensation", insert the following: "but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital."

That is, by anyone dealing with the United States Government.

In other words, if my amendment is adopted, no one will be able to make a

greater profit than 10 percent on a contract held with the United States Government.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that my request to insert in the RECORD the remainder of the speech which I made in May 1944 was not granted, I desire to read, first of all, the remainder of the speech which I made upon that occasion:

The Truman committee cited chapter and verse on the profits of various corporations. It tells of a New York aircraft corporation which had average peacetime profits of \$32,493, but multiplied that figure 168 times in 1942 after paying taxes and dividends.

I am sorry the distinguished acting minority leader has gone, because that statement shows what kind of an administration the Democrats gave this country. At that time they had control of the White House, the House of Representatives, and the Senate. Yet under that kind of control a company raised its profits, according to the Truman committee report, 168 times.

The Truman report continues:

A small Pennsylvania airplane company which was reported to have an average deficit of more than \$70,000—

Mind you, a deficit of more than \$70,000 each year between 1936 and 1939—

had a profit of \$11,400,000 in 1942.

I can only say, Mr. President, that it is my judgment if the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] had been in charge, someone would have gone to jail. The idea of a company having a loss of more than \$70,000 year after year and then having a profit in 1942 of \$11,400,000. That is the kind of a Government we had under Mr. Roosevelt with a Democratic House of Representatives and a Democratic Senate. That is the heritage which Mr. Truman had to assume.

The Truman committee report continues:

A concern in New York in 1942 increased its profits 25 times.

An Ohio locomotive plant increased its profits around 42 times.

They made \$1,000 before, but they made \$42,000 in 1942.

A Pennsylvania corporation increased its profits 10 times.

That is all quoted from the Truman committee report, Mr. President.

The story could be extended endlessly. The illustrations given are not exceptional. They happen to have been taken at random among the 100 corporations holding the largest volume of war contracts. For smaller companies the profit picture is equally as excessive. Only occasionally did a manufacturer bob up who placed his country's welfare above his pocket. One such is the United Aircraft Corporation of Connecticut, whose officials came to Washington and turned back \$286,000,000 to the Government. They said they were ashamed to take the money. But after making the refund the committee observed the company still had left, after taxes, in the year 1942, \$17,000,000 of net profit, which was a little more than three times its average profit of \$5,000,000 a year during the prewar base period.

What became of President Roosevelt's promise that a new crop of millionaires would not come out of this war? What

becomes of the plea of certain leaders in the House and Senate that we cannot increase the taxes of the rich, and that if we are to get additional revenue we must place new tax burdens on small incomes?

They surely put taxes on small incomes. Consider the school teachers, Mr. President. Oh, I remember so well when the tax bill was being considered. On the other side sat the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. He offered an amendment. He said to the Senators that when a banker or a merchant goes to a national convention, every single penny of the expense, all his entertainment expenses, can be taken off his income tax.

As I said before, the President of the National Teachers' Association appeared before our committee. He testified that in nearly every State in the Union a school teacher is required to attend summer school, and the average cost involved is \$200. The teacher must attend summer school or lose her certificate. It is part of her business. So the Senator from Florida offered an amendment to the tax bill providing that the poor teacher should be on an equality with the banker or with the merchant who attends a convention. Mind you, Mr. President, the tax would amount to only \$5 or \$6. The Senator from Florida did not ask that the whole \$200 come off, but merely that the tax be deducted from the gross.

The Senate refused to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, I believe, by a vote of 44 to 40. In effect, the Senate said go ahead and let the poor teachers, who today are and at that time were the most underpaid profession in the entire United States, go to summer school and get along the best way they possibly can.

Mr. President, I was discussing Henry Wallace's testimony before the committee. Again I say not a single word has been said on the floor of the Senate to refute his testimony. He said:

The armaments program, compulsory training, and the draft would be profitable to big business. For the common man, they mean harder work and lower living standards. He will make the sacrifices, while the corporations will add armament profits to inflation profits.

Further along, Mr. Wallace, testifying, said:

The armament boom will bring fantastic profits to the big corporation.

Under my amendment, Mr. President, that would not be possible, because they would be limited to 10 percent.

Even before receiving war orders, they were making double the profits they made during World War II. With their own men handling procurements, they will dictate their own terms on war contracts for the Truman-Forrestal doctrine. They will monopolize supplies of raw materials and freeze out independent businessmen. In a sellers' market, with increasing scarcities, they will push prices through the clouds.

Not a word is uttered here to refute his testimony.

The guns instead of butter formula is already evident. In 1947, the first year of the cold war, per capita civilian consumption declined by 2 percent, and food con-

sumption by 1 percent. The Department of Agriculture predicts a further drop in food consumption this year, and this will become a sharp decline if the military are permitted to build up huge stocks to feed the Army they have in mind.

The Army will have 435,000 new men. The size of the present Army is 1,070,000, and according to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, they will draft 435,000 more.

Mr. President, Mr. Wallace's testimony dovetails right in with that. He said:

Housing will be the first victim of increasingly acute shortages of steel and lumber and building labor used for military projects.

Instead of building houses they will be building more military projects, says Mr. Wallace; and that makes sense to me. I do not know whether it did to the committee or not, but I remember when I tried during the war to get tractors and binders and farm machinery for the farmers in the Northwest, I was told there was a shortage of steel, that they could not manufacture the machinery, that the military authorities needed the steel for war purposes. So the farmers had to go without. The present Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECKRON], is familiar with western North Dakota, I know. In one county, the county of Hettinger, of which the county seat is Mott, N. Dak., I held a hearing. Four hundred farmers came to the hearing. I was particularly impressed with the testimony of the county agent, a Democrat. I shall never forget it. He said that the farmers could not get any new machinery. They had binders manufactured in 1927 and they could not get new parts for them. A farmer who had a tractor, a modern tractor at that, who broke a little gadget, drove 800 miles, in spite of the shortage of gasoline and the shortage of rubber, and paid 75 cents, in the State of my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, so that he could repair his tractor and make it run. The testimony of the county agent was that because of their being unable to get new machinery, and because of the fact also that they could not get repairs for their old machinery, the loss in flax and wheat in that one county was a million dollars in 1943.

Mr. Wallace testified before the committee that if we pass the bill now before us one of the first effects will be a shortage in housing, the steel and building materials being used in the erection of military projects, while GI veterans who are trying to get little homes are unable to get any material.

Mr. Wallace said further:

Eventually with millions of workers forced to move again to new locations to produce war materials, a new and greater housing shortage will be piled onto the existing shortage.

These shortages will not plague big business firms—for they will make more profits than ever out of the shortage and out of orders for military goods.

The one cloud on the business horizon is the fear that the American people may rise and demand that Congress reject the remobilization proposals of the administration.

The only fear on the business horizon is the fear that the American people may

rise up against this iniquitous bill. That is the only thing they are afraid of.

Mr. President, I am not in any hurry about getting this bill through, a bill that is going to take 435,000 boys away from their homes.

I have here a letter which I received from the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, one of the great organizations of America. This organization, in my judgment, has done as much good for the youth of America as any organization within the history of the United States. This is what it wrote me under date of June 7:

DEAR SENATOR: The Senate draft bill, although it has been amended to make military training for 18-year-olds voluntary rather than compulsory, still contains a provision for training some 161,000 18-year-olds in regular armed services and along with the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

The President's Commission on Universal Training said:

"We must admit at once that a serious moral problem is presented by the very removal of a boy of 18 from the normal influences of his home, church, school, and local community, and his comparative isolation in a camp with large numbers of other men under an entirely new and different environment."

They recommended:

That is, Mr. Truman's committee recommended; not the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union—

They recommended:

"(7) limitation of the opportunities for the purchase by trainees of any alcoholic beverages, including beer, through (a) prohibiting the sale thereof to them on any military, naval, or other camp reservation, or in any post exchange, ship's store, or canteen, (b) declaring "off-limits" to trainees all taverns, taprooms, and similar facilities whose principal business is selling alcoholic beverages, (c) soliciting the assistance of local communities in this program, and (d) making it a Federal crime knowingly to sell such beverages to any person in training."

Furthermore, under this bill you are drafting 19- and 20-year-olds, boys whom their home communities would protect against the sale of alcoholic beverages. In the absence of Federal legislation, they were not protected in the Army in World War II, with the result that Dr. Harvey J. Tompkins, assistant chief of the psychoneurotic service, has estimated that 10 percent of all World War II patients discharged from veterans hospitals last year entered with a primary diagnosis of alcoholism. He gave the figure for all wars, including World War II, as 12.8 percent.

You will not benefit the defense of America by permitting these boys to be exploited by what General Marshall described as "sordid commercial interests." May we, on behalf of the many members of our own organization and the many parents of teenage boys, again urge you not to pass this bill without proper safeguards against alcohol and vice.

Very respectfully,

ELIZABETH A. SMART,
National Woman's Christian
Temperance Union.

That shows pretty well, Mr. President, that Mr. Wallace knew what he was talking about when he spoke of that situation, because, as I said before, it jibes quite well with what he said.

A story published in the Journal of Commerce—

Mr. Wallace said—

on March 22, 1948, interprets the business outlook in these terms:

"One official recalled * * * that 2 weeks ago he had predicted that only a worsening international situation could prevent a business adjustment.

"Now, he says, only an improved international situation can dim the business outlook."

Mr. Wallace said:

This is a cold statement that what is bad for the world is good for business.

Mr. Wallace said, and I repeat it:

This is a cold statement that what is bad for the world is good for business. But that is only true for big business and international financiers.

I repeat that Mr. Wallace was the great ideal of the Democrats. Some of the members of the Armed Services Committee were political friends of Mr. Wallace. At least one of them seconded his nomination at Chicago. Mr. Wallace was the great prophet in 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944. Mr. Wallace apparently was thought by some to be the best man in the whole world to be Secretary of Commerce, and he was confirmed with the advice and consent of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The Republicans, it will be remembered, opposed Mr. Wallace. The Democrats were in a majority, and they were for him. If he was such a great man only 2 or 3 years ago, why is not his testimony worthy of consideration now? But, Mr. President, have you heard one single Democrat, one Member on the other side of the aisle, read Mr. Wallace's testimony or give its contents upon this floor? Not one has done so. No; it remained for a Republican like myself to bring to the attention of the Senate the testimony of Mr. Wallace.

Mr. Wallace continues:

While the huge corporations tap the rich lode of armament profits, the common people will be increasingly subjected to the regimentation of a militarist economy. The administration asked for a military draft and universal military training. But this little draft will be followed by a labor draft. It will be needed to man the war factories as labor shortages follow increased conscription. But even more important, it will be required to regiment the people, to stifle criticism, to freeze wages and terrorize the unions.

The Journal of Commerce on March 18, 1948, reported that a stand-by manpower control plan would soon be initiated. It said:

"The situation is serious enough * * * to warrant a request for manpower control right now. But political expediency left no room for it. * * * Only by keeping the initial proposals relatively innocuous * * * was it possible to obtain congressional support."

Remobilization for war abroad involves intensified attacks against American labor.

So, Mr. President, we come right back to the speech made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] the day he opened the debate upon the bill. What did he say? He said that we want a force which we could send to every continent except Australia. The United States has grown up all right. We are not merely taking

care of the United States any more, but we are taking care of all the continents except Australia. So we are going to send our boys all over the world, and the prophecy I made when the Senate adopted the United Nations Charter, that England was placing the burden upon the United States is coming true.

England used to send the money to keep Greece going. She no longer does so, but the taxpayers of the United States pay the bill. We are sending our hard-earned dollars all over the world. Now they are not satisfied with our money, but they want the blood of our boys in every continent except Australia, says my distinguished friend from South Dakota. The bill may be passed, but the senior Senator from North Dakota will not vote to send boys between the ages of 19 and 25 to every country on the globe except Australia.

How well I remember the speech of Winston Churchill, which came over the radio a few years ago. He said, in substance, "All we want is the material. Give us the guns. We do not want the men." But after England had the guns, she sent for the men. England now wants to turn Singapore over to us to take care of for her.

Mr. President, I repeat that not a single Democrat has referred to Mr. Wallace's testimony. This is the same Mr. Wallace who, when he went to any of the States in 1940 or 1941, was accompanied to the rostrum by my distinguished friends. They were glad to be seen with the Vice President of the United States. Today no one quotes him, and it remains for a Republican to get his views before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of Mr. Wallace's statement printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks. I want it clearly understood that I am not saying that I agree with him at all.

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

Remobilization for war abroad involves intensified attacks against American labor. Employers are advised by the business press that remobilization will increase inflationary pressures—and that these must be offset by resolute opposition to demands for higher wages.

President Truman has given the workers a foretaste of what is being planned for them under the remobilization program. He has invoked the Taft-Hartley injunction against labor in the atomic energy industry. The head of the Atomic Energy Commission has warned that the Government cannot permit strikes on atomic projects and industries supplying them with critical materials. That will now be extended to cover all industry—since the whole economy will be required to service the remobilization program. Taft-Hartley has been invoked in the disputes in the coal and meat-packing industries, and with reference to the typographical union.

The labor draft and the outlawing of strikes will be accompanied by a wage freeze—already called for by President Truman and Bernard Baruch. Living standards must be driven down in a militarized economy—and this can be most effectively accomplished by a wage freeze. It is presented, of course, in the guise of combating the inflation fed by the war boom.

A longer working week will also be forced on the workers. Ever since the war ended, big business spokesmen have sought to cripple the Fair Labor Standards Act and abolish the 40-hour week. With millions of workers drafted into the Army and shifted to munitions factories, labor shortages will be used as the pretext to lengthen the working week and destroy the remaining safeguards of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Unlimited profits for the corporations and forced labor for workers will be the consequences of the remobilization program. The Forrestal plan will bring death and taxes for the many, and very handsome profits for the few.

The first effect, of course, is on those young men who are trained to kill. Not only do they learn to kill, senselessly, in a war in which there can be no victory, but they are deprived at the same time of the training necessary for purposeful, constructive, peaceful lives. For every 1,000,000 men who undergo 6 months of military training, we lose 500,000 man-years of study in the arts and crafts of peace and in the training in the sciences and humanities of civilization.

What may be less obvious is that this conditioning for war will not only affect the trainees themselves, it will be universal.

As stated in Ewald Banse, "philosopher" of nazism, a basic essential to war preparations is to "draft the minds of the whole people for war." The prime importance of doing this was stated long ago by Hitler's teacher, General Ludendorff, who pointed out that every war must be presented to the people as a fight for existence, and not an aggressive war. "To accomplish this," said Ludendorff, "one must reiterate to the people that there is an immediate danger of war."

The preparations and plans for compulsory military training and the draft do not differ from this concept.

Gen. Leonard Wood, initiator of citizens military training camps, admitted their futility as practical aspects of national defense and went on to reveal the real purpose when he said:

"We do not expect . . . to accomplish much in the way of detailed military instruction . . . but we do believe a great deal can be done in the implanting of sound military policy."

The same thing has been said many times by civilians, notably by educators.

Sir Norman Angell remarked:

"Conscription to be effective must be a conscription of minds as well as bodies . . . the state must take charge not only of the expression of opinion, but of the dissemination of facts which lead to the formation of opinion."

Brig. Gen. Henry J. Reilly, retired, described ideal training as follows:

"The Army is supposed to fight. Leave the morale to the Army and to hell with morals. Some people want to keep the young soldier from women and liquor. That's what he needs."

Major Hinman, of the Morale Division told a writer:

"It is not our job to teach the men in the Army what is right. It is simply to teach them to fight for what is right—as laid down by the Government."

Let us consider the impact of thinking like this, in the teaching of all our young people. In the current war psychosis, what is "right" as laid down by the Government? Current events teachers may be permitted to say that our Government's betrayal on Palestine was "unfortunate" but they will be compelled to add that it is "right." It will be "right" because it adds to the profits of the oil monopolists. They will have to teach that it is "right" to feed the power of Fascist Franco, Salazar, Peron, Chiang Kai-shek, and the Grand Mufti and the puppets of Greece and Turkey.

Civics teachers will be compelled to teach that only Reds are in favor of racial equal-

ity, for segregation at this time is a fixed part of military life. It will be their job to explain how "right" it is for the President of the United States to trail along behind the British Foreign Minister in slandering loyal Americans of Jewish faith who have helped to build a refuge for other Jews in Palestine.

UMT and the draft will not only affect the youth who sacrifice their schooling and their rights as citizens. It will be a draft and military training for the whole people. The military virus will infect every school, every college, every scientific institute; and the press, the radio, the magazine, the films—all media of mass communications will be reduced to gears in the war machine.

We have seen the bullying and blackmail of decent men and women who spoke the truth on the radio. We have seen the reign of terror instigated by the Thomas-Rankin committee sweeping away the livelihoods of writers, teachers, and scientists.

It is this aggressive military doctrine which constitutes the real threat to American security.

I share with Dr. Albert Einstein the conviction that UMT "would be harmful to the welfare and security of our Nation."

It is the special pleaders for universal military training, for the draft, for a huge air force, for more battleships, for more and bigger destructive atom bombs, who are endangering our American security.

A calm appraisal of our current military policy demonstrates that even on a purely military level it offers no security, and threatens us with disaster.

The administration's military policy is expensive, wasteful, unbalanced, and contradictory.

In 1947 we spent on our Military Establishment a sum equal to the total spent by six leading world powers in 1938. But our fighting forces are unbalanced, lopsided, and in a state of crisis.

Proposed new expenditures would make them more so. The Congressional Aviation Policy Board demands \$10,000,000,000 a year to build our air strength. Proponents of UMT will ask an additional 2 to \$5,000,000,000 a year for their military kindergarten. The armed services are already asking a military budget for the next fiscal year of some \$14,000,000,000 but Washington reports indicate that the actual expenditures will be closer to \$20,000,000,000, while additional billions may be spent for lend-lease to the western military bloc. A yearly military budget of 40 to \$50,000,000,000 is already hinted at by journalistic spokesmen of the administration.

But there is no hint of a responsible military policy.

With expenditures of over \$2,500,000,000 for land forces, we have been able to maintain two and a half combat divisions in the continental United States. General Eisenhower has admitted there is no program for reform for our land forces.

Our tremendously strong Navy—greater than the navies of all the rest of the world combined—is without strategic justification except for purposes of conquest.

The administration's military policy places its chief strategic reliance on the atom bomb. It is arming us, therefore, for a war without limits or inhibitions—a war as dangerous for ourselves as it is for others.

Army leaders and Air Force leaders hold contradictory conceptions about the functions and importance of land power. The Navy on the one hand, and the Army and the Air Force on the other, disagree on the functions of the Navy and the possibilities of its use in atomic war. There is a split between the advocates of blitz war and its adversaries. There are differences between those who believe the Air Force should use primarily atomic weapons and those who believe it should be prepared to fight with or without atomic bombs. There are many divergent

conceptions of the functions of the Navy even among naval leaders themselves.

These contradictory conceptions reflect the fact that the administration has no sound military policy. This lack of an overall policy is an indication that it is not the security of our country which is the essential concern of the military.

The more closely we examine the administration's military policy the more clearly we can see that it is not designed for security. The administration's military policy has as its object the imposition of military control of every kind whether purposeful or not. This is not a program for security but a political program to control the American people.

This is most clearly demonstrated in the case of universal military training.

UMT is militarily valueless.

This is admitted by military experts, as for instance, John Henry Martin, former consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who wrote recently:

"Universal military training or, to call it by its older and more honest name, conscription, would be the most expensive military delusion this Nation could undertake. To adopt it would undermine our true strength, drain our public funds in wasteful activity, and leave us in ostrich-blind exposure."

UMT does not prepare trained reserves. It does not lay the ground for an American land force. If we need trained reserves, we now have 15,000,000 veterans of World War II who, as Mr. Martin has pointed out constitute a reserve of trained personnel that will be available for at least 10 more years.

The 6 months' training proposed by UMT can offer at the very best no more than a quarter of the knowledge and skill required for the education of the modern soldier. This is indeed no more than a military nursery school, corresponding roughly to the German labor service, instituted by the Nazis, as a preparation for Hitler's Wehrmacht.

UMT will be wholly wasted on more than 70 percent of the trainees since the experience of World War II showed that approximately 7 men are needed in essential non-combat duty for every soldier at the front.

UMT will waste fully 30 percent of our officer corps, who would have to be used to shepherd the trainees through elementary training routine.

UMT in sum can prepare only a police force on the home front, at high cost and without military value. Some of its advocates openly and cynically admit that it is no more than mass education for police purposes. A writer in the New York Herald Tribune declared March 7, 1948:

"We should have the military training of youth because we ought to have the product of it for police purposes whether it is of any military value or not."

The proposal for UMT is nothing but military irresponsibility. It was recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training along with other proposals to build up atomic weapons, increase our fighting forces, indoctrinate our citizens. In short, UMT was proposed as part of the universal militarization of America. The Commission's report threw in everything in outlining a reckless policy of expansion without limit and without knowledge of what is important or unimportant.

The Congress should realize that the policy recommended by the administration and its military spokesmen is only the beginning of a series of demands for higher and higher military expenditures without any ceiling. If Congress yields to present demands, thus opening the way for a policy of reckless militarism, every service will demand more and more billions. The appetites of the military chiefs will grow. They ask more arms not to protect America but because they want more power.

It is reported that Mr. Truman's request for additional military budget will total \$4,000,000,000. However, the cat was let out of the bag in the testimony of the defense chiefs before this committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, last Thursday, March 24. W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, admitted that his service wanted a much bigger expansion than Mr. Forrestal had previously reported to the committee. The report in the New York Times of March 26 said that when Mr. Forrestal was recalled to the witness chair, he appeared to regret exceedingly that this issue had arisen. He conceded that it had been drawn out of Mr. Symington and General Spaatz by committee questioning. But he warned that such a program might call for additional expenditures of \$15,000,000,000.

"Mr. Forrestal indicated that it was his conclusion that it would be futile to request Congress for such sums at this point."

Thus the strategy is plain—ask for only 3 or 4 billions extra now then after a few months and a new synthetic crisis, raise the ante to 15 billion, as planned all along.

The real potential military budget even for next year may prove to be as high as \$25,000,000,000, quite apart from the foreign political adventures.

Militarily, this policy will lead nowhere or to world explosion since it is a policy based on the impossible conception of American military control of the globe. This is a geographical, political, and military impossibility. Even the United States cannot saturate the world with its bases and military power.

Only a few weeks ago, the Congress was asked to vote billions for what was called the economic reconstruction of Europe. Now it is being asked to vote even more billions for rearmament and still higher demands are being blueprinted. But we cannot have both rearmament and reconstruction. World recovery is incompatible with an unlimited investment in armament.

American security and the security of all peoples are threatened by the administration's military policy. American military needs cannot be based on the destruction of the major part of the European and Asiatic Continents from the air nor on the conquest of these continents.

American security must be based on the recognition that in the modern world real security can only be attained through universal peace and not a program of world conquest.

American security depends on the ability of American policy to help create the premises of peace. The best policy of national defense is a constructive peace policy. The problem of American security cannot be solved by rearmament. The War Department has itself realized this. It stated in a paper published April 8, 1947:

"The atomic bomb and the potential of aircraft and missiles has made the defense of the Nation more difficult, more expensive, and less certain of attainment. The need of eliminating war itself has never been so vitally necessary to the national security of the United States and to the survival of civilization throughout the world."

The building of a military machine even on the scale recommended by the administration will not prevent war; nor will it win a war—there can be no victory in another world war. Military power alone only intensifies rivalries and tensions which finally set off military conflict. David Lawrence in the March 26, 1948, issue of the United States News summed up this lesson of world experience in these words:

"For decades and decades military men have argued that military preparedness prevents war. This is an illusion. . . . to say that a standing military force ever prevented a war is to deceive oneself. For generations standing armies in Europe have been

a factor in postponing wars only until another nation could build up a rival army or its equivalent in naval power."

The efforts of the administration to frighten the world with a show of force will not bring peace. It will only intensify the efforts of Soviet Russia and its allies to become equally strong.

Instead of taking a path which must inevitably lead to war, I urge the Congress to adopt a military policy which will not only insure the national security of the United States but promote world peace.

A sound military policy must be based on sound political objectives. If the United States were to reverse the Truman doctrine with its program of unlimited aggression, then it could develop and carry out a military policy that would truly safeguard national security at a small fraction of present military expenditures.

If the political objective is peace and not war, then the Military Establishment of the United States should fit the needs of the American people. This should be a modern, first-class defense force, based on scientific research and the latest developments in military technology.

With such a scientific Military Establishment, the United States could not be threatened anywhere in the world, since it would be backed up by the almost limitless war potential of our incomparable industrial power and the millions of trained reserves who fought in World War II. This would more than overbalance in military terms the power of any other nation or combination of nations on the globe.

No nation actually threatens our vital interests anywhere in the world. No power would dare attack the United States. Since the only thing we have to fear is the irrational fear whipped up by unfounded war hysteria, we can protect our national security while taking the lead in transforming the United Nations into a bulwark of peace and prosperity throughout the world.

The United States should lead from its real strength—its democratic traditions, its unmatched industrial capacity, its creative abilities which have made it the first Nation in the world. It can regain the leadership it had during the war by going back again down the road of good neighborliness, charted by Roosevelt.

In the spirit of cooperation, the American people must work for disarmament, the outlawing of unlimited weapons of destruction such as the atomic bomb, the promotion of international friendship, laying the foundations for universal peace through the instrumentality of the United Nations.

Peace will come if the American people and their Government really work for peace. If they have the will to peace, war can be prevented. Congress owes it to the fathers and mothers of America whose sons will be sacrificed on the altar of war to reject the Truman doctrine, turn down the proposals for remobilization which will commit the Nation irrevocably to Armageddon. Let Congress follow the hopes and wishes of the American people and declare its determination to stop the drift to war.

The CHAIRMAN. While you are waiting for the balance of your statement, is it not a fact that you, through your campaign manager, Mr. Anderson—Mr. B. Anderson—telephoned and asked—

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Baldwin—Mr. C. B. Baldwin—yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baldwin, from your office on Park Avenue.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Baldwin asked for my appearance here; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. About the same time each Member of the Senate, I believe, at least I did, received a telegram from you dated March 17, I think that is correct, an Irish date; is that correct?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, the morning of March 17 it was sent to each Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. That telegram, I believe, had better go in the record at this point. (The telegram is as follows:)

MARCH 17, 1948.

Hon. C. GURNEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your responsibility and that of the other Members of the Congress to quell the war hysteria which is being fanned by the military and cartel members of the administration is brought into sharp focus by the President's convening of another emergency joint session. There is no evidence that any nation has threatened acts of aggression against us or threatens our national security. Yet the President and members of his Cabinet act as though a war crisis were imminent. The people look to the Congress for calmness and sanity. They expect you to guard them against dangerous and wholly unnecessary steps which will curtail their liberties and take us down the road to an economic and political life regimented by the military.

Twice before the President has convened the Congress in an atmosphere of artificially created crisis to cover up failures of his own policy. In May 1946, the President made an inflammatory attack on the railroad workers and called for repressive legislation which the Congress wisely rejected. Again, in March 1947, the President created another crisis to get military aid for Greece and Turkey. He embarked us on a course which has now proved bankrupt.

The crisis in international affairs results from the complete failure of the Truman doctrine throughout the world. The way out of this crisis is to renounce the doctrine as the basis of our foreign policy. We must stop finding excuses for ignoring the peace-making machinery of the United Nations.

The American people cannot understand why a democratic election in Italy should be used to increase international hysteria merely because the administration fears the results may displease it. The Congress must give evidence that when we speak of democracy we mean democracy. The present administration is ruining the good name of the American people the world over. It rests with the Congress to quell the hysteria and set up a standard for the observance of democratic principles which will enable us to regain moral leadership in world affairs and in the cause of peace.

HENRY A. WALLACE.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you care to wait for the balance of your statement?

Mr. WALLACE. This is a sort of summing up or condensation.

President Truman first recommended UMT 2 months after VJ-day. That gave the American people time to look at it and decide that they did not want it. Even the new synthetic crisis, it appeared that Congress might not pass this measure.

So President Truman and Mr. Forrestal brought forward the other part of their program to militarize the American people—the draft. They would have asked for it sooner or later, anyhow, but the resistance to UMT caused them to advocate the draft, as something mild and temporary, in the hope that Congress would pass this, even if it rejected UMT.

Mr. Truman in his crisis speech asked for only a temporary draft, and Mr. Forrestal asked for the registration of 36,600,000—I think that is 3,600,000 men—but estimated that only 220,000 would be drafted. We are told that the draft is necessary only as an emergency measure to bring the armed forces up to authorized strength, because of the inadequate level of voluntary recruitment.

If the services really want to build up to authorized strength through voluntary enlistments, I will tell them an easy way to do it.

1. Stop the war propaganda. Resume a peaceful, cooperative foreign policy. Withdraw American troops from intervention in Greece, China, and other places.

2. Improve the pay and conditions of enlisted men. Improve relations between officers and men.

3. Abolish all forms of discrimination in the armed services, which keep out thousands of Negro recruits.

Mr. Forrestal, Mr. Royall, and their associates know these things as well as you and I. Their call for a limited draft is a screen for the much more sinister objective of militarizing America.

The real intention is to draft, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of men into the armed services. The real intention is to register not only young men, but all men of potential military value for service in the armed forces. The real intention is to draft all men and all women for militarized labor.

Congress is being asked to pass a limited draft on an emergency basis. But even this limited draft will give the powers to conscript several million men. And it is only an opening wedge for demanding the ultimate objective which I have stated. Once Congress grants the initial power, the conditions will be created for provoking new emergencies, for coming to Congress with even more urgent demands for the unlimited powers which are really wanted—or for declaring an emergency and putting them into effect without recourse to Congress. UMT and the draft are two sides of the same plan, and constitute a direct attack on the liberties of all Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Senator ROBERTSON?

Senator ROBERTSON. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator RUSSELL.

Senator RUSSELL. I have a question or two, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wallace, if you will indulge me a pleasantry, I might say that I have heard the statement all of my life, about the Devil quoting Scripture, but if the Devil had appeared here, horns, forked tail, and pitchforks, reading from the Holy Writ, I could not have been more surprised than to hear you rely upon the Wall Street Journal and the Journal of Commerce, and the spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. WALLACE. Are you inferring that the Wall Street Journal is the Bible, sir?

Senator RUSSELL. No, sir; but I noticed you quoted it. I noticed you adopted it as your Bible and quoted it very approvingly on more than one instance.

Mr. WALLACE. I did so because I felt that it might appeal to certain members of the committee as a Bible.

Senator RUSSELL. I am sure you exempt me from that, because I was the author of the revision of the first Draft Act of 1940, to provide for a draft of industry also, one that unfortunately the administration of which you were part of did not put into effect very often.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not have in mind, Senator, I may say, that you were afflicted with this tendency to look on the Wall Street Journal as your Bible.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not take these quotes.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator RUSSELL, Mr. Wallace comes from his office on Park Avenue in New York. Do not forget that.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not attach any significance to that.

Mr. Wallace, you have very definitely rejected any idea of universal military service, of any renewal of selective service. You have been very critical, if I understood your statement correctly, of any enlargement of the air forces of the country. You state that the Navy is much too large and should be greatly reduced.

If you were President of the United States at this time, what suggestions would you make to your Secretary of Defense as to the proper size of the Military Establishment to protect this country in today's world?

Mr. WALLACE. I think anyone who is Secretary of National Defense must think in terms of the possible next war, instead of in terms of the last war. I am talking now about the Secretary of National Defense, not the President.

Senator RUSSELL. Have the peace treaties been signed for this war, World War II?

Mr. WALLACE. Beg pardon, sir?

Senator RUSSELL. You said the last war. Have the peace treaties been signed for World War II?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, only in part, of course. It is not over, but that common terminology to look upon the war as essentially completed.

But to get back to the main point, I do feel that a military man, in order to be true to the security of this Nation, must think in terms of the next possible conflict, instead of in terms of the last conflict, and therefore a military man, in view of the various types of dangerous weapons which are now available, must think in terms of the science involved in those weapons.

Now, that is not a matter of training young boys for 6 months. That is a matter of having an exceedingly well-trained force, we will say, of perhaps a million men. I do not know the precise number that would be needed, but they must be full-time men, fully trained.

To some extent you misquoted precisely what I said with regard to the Air Force and Navy, but we will let that pass. You misquoted me.

Senator RUSSELL. Let us get it right. Here is the language that I have tried to mark, some of it, as I heard you read it. You state in here—

"Our tremendously strong Navy, greater than the navies of all of the rest of the world combined, is without strategic justification except for purposes of conquest."

So unless you as President would embark upon an imperialistic course of conquest, it would be too large, according to your own statement.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I agree that it would be too large.

Senator RUSSELL. About what do you think, if you were the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, would be the proper size for the Army and Navy and Air Force in today's troubled world? Do you think that a million men in all branches of the service would suffice?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I do not see how anyone could possibly make a statement without going into that in very great detail with the Chiefs of the Army and the Navy and Air Force.

Senator RUSSELL. But you are convinced that the present establishment is too large.

Mr. WALLACE. Granted that we have a proper foreign policy, I say unqualifiedly that the present establishment is too large.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes. Now, you state here that—

Mr. WALLACE. But with our present policy, it is not large enough, and cannot possibly be made large enough.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I am not altogether happy about our present foreign policy, but for entirely different reasons than you hold and express.

You have stated here that we are going to set off an armaments race. You are aware of the fact that Russia, which we may in all frankness say is the only potential enemy we have that could wage war on us, has 350 divisions under arms at the present time; are you not?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know of anyone who knows precisely the number. We all

assume that it is a very large number of men under arms at the present time.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I think I have seen, if not in the Wall Street Journal or the Commerce Journal, at least in the New York Times or the New York Herald Tribune that you also quote, that Russia did have 350 divisions under arms.

How are we setting off any armaments race in view of the fact that we have practically demobilized the greatest military force that the world ever saw, and are now just proposing to recapture a little of the security that we had at the end of World War II?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, undoubtedly as we seek to expand our armed forces, Russia again will proceed to go all out to expand her armed forces even further. I think there can be no question about that. Her chief reliance, of course, is on men. It is not on battleships or even on air power.

We can expect her to go even further. I certainly do not take Russia as a model for what we do.

Senator RUSSELL. No, sir. Well, we might differ about that.

You state here that you are very critical of the propaganda in this country, and you quoted, let me see if I can find this here, General Ludendorff saying that you had to have a policy of fear.

Would not that same statement have applied today to Russia if you had just stricken Ludendorff's name and substituted Stalin? Are they not constantly preaching they are being encircled, and are gravely endangered by the capitalistic imperialism of the United States?

Mr. WALLACE. Stalin stated so in his speech in February of 1946. I have not been following what has been said specifically since. I assume they are continuing to preach that. I would be surprised if they did not, because—

Senator RUSSELL. You think it is a fact.

Mr. WALLACE. If we were, if Russia happened to have bases within striking distance of our shores, a great many different bases in striking distance from our shores, and if the Russian air chief were boasting that he could fly their aircraft and strike any possible plant in the United States and return to those bases, I think that we might think that we were being encircled.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, do you mean—

Mr. WALLACE. I say the Russians do have, I would be surprised if they did not preach it; as I say I have not been aware of the specific statements, but I have not been reading the Russian press.

Senator RUSSELL. It is rather general knowledge in this country through the American press that the Russians have been preaching the doctrine of encirclement, and that they are in grave danger from capitalistic imperialism at the hands of the United States.

Do you, Mr. Wallace, advocate complete reversal of what you referred to as the Truman doctrine?

Mr. WALLACE. That is correct.

Senator RUSSELL. As I understand it—

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. You would have us pull out of Greece immediately?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. To stop any aid whatever to Turkey?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; that is correct.

Senator RUSSELL. Remove our fleet from the Mediterranean.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that from the standpoint of attaining world peace it might be essential before all of that were done to have a meeting with Stalin in order to have an over-all agreement. It might be a very wise thing to do. That certainly should be our objective as rapidly as it can be done with regard to all of the factors.

Senator RUSSELL. I thought you categorically advocated here withdraw American

troops from intervention in Greece, China, and other places. Would that not relate to the fleet in the Mediterranean?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; certainly.

Senator RUSSELL. And that would also, you would also annul the European relief plan as it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. WALLACE. If you want to get into that, I have stood continually, and still stand, for very comprehensive relief to the people of Europe on the basis of the damage done to them by the Axis during the war.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir; I have been more diligent as a reader of the papers than you have. I am more familiar with your view. I was referring to the European relief plan, as such.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not in favor of furnishing relief on the basis of dividing Europe. I have not been at any time. I recognize that it might be necessary for an interim period in order to take care of hungry people in Italy and France in particular, it might be necessary for a certain number of months to make sure that certain quantities of food got to them, but as rapidly as could be done, we should get a new plan based on the United Nations and not based on help through the United States alone. Otherwise I know that we are going to be hated by the rank and file of all of the people of Europe.

I would like to have other nations bearing the burden of that obloquy. We are going to be feeling ourselves in the United States we have done a great many favors for millions of Europeans; at the same time those millions will hate us. I do not like it.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you know of any way whereby we could force Russia to join in this program short of war?

Mr. WALLACE. I think it can be done if Russia feels that we are not out to attack her.

Senator RUSSELL. And that would involve all of these military withdrawals that you have indicated you favor?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, as I say, I think that ought to be part of an over-all settlement with Stalin.

Senator RUSSELL. But leaving out the meeting with Stalin, you do not know of any great deal of difference in the program that you suggest here and that is being advocated by Mr. Stalin's mouthpieces, Pravda and Izvestia, and their propaganda?

Mr. WALLACE. You are more familiar with those publications than I am.

Senator RUSSELL. I try to keep up with them. I think it is a duty of every American to do so. I recommend it to you.

You refer here to the fact that the American security is threatened by the endeavors of backward countries everywhere to lift themselves from feudalism into the modern world of the twentieth century.

We are undertaking to help France, Britain, Belgium, Holland, and in the present European relief plan, have not those countries embarked upon a program more or less of state socialism? Would you not call that throwing off feudalism?

Mr. WALLACE. I would not say that any of those countries were in a state of feudalism. I say that Greece and Turkey are definitely in a state of feudalism. They never went through anything corresponding to the French or the American Revolutions. I would say that China also was definitely in that position.

Senator RUSSELL. You referred in your remarks to something about a strike in the atomic-energy plant. Do you believe that the Government of the United States should permit the atomic plant to be closed down by a strike by the people there in labor organizations walking about without exhausting all of the resources of the law?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not believe that the current trumped-up emergency is such as to warrant injunctions under the Taft-Hartley

Act, to prevent labor from striking in order to obtain its just demands.

Senator RUSSELL. Even in the atomic energy plant?

Mr. WALLACE. Even in the atomic energy plant. As a matter of fact, you may know I have advocated steadily that we should build up a stock pile of atomic bombs, so I have felt that is one of the key things that is responsible for much of the present difficulty in the world.

Senator RUSSELL. That was the next question I wished to ask, that if you were the Commander in Chief at the present time, you would cease all operations looking to the construction of atomic bombs?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say, too, I would immediately use that as one of my bargaining points with Stalin, "See here, we are ready to stop construction of atomic bombs and ready to do this, we are ready to do other things, if you will do this, if you will do that, if you will do the other thing," and come to an agreement, an over-all agreement on the important points.

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Wallace, do you think there is any other man in the United States besides yourself who could reach an agreement on all of the details with Stalin?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I think that I could be very helpful in it.

Senator RUSSELL. "Barkis is willing."

In case of a war, would you favor or oppose the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon?

Mr. WALLACE. I will say first that if the United States dropped the atomic bomb in a preventive war, the United States would go down in history for more than a hundred years as a nation having made one of the most dastardly acts.

If it were done on a preventive basis, as a certain rather small group in Washington would like to see done, that would be destructive of United States prestige for probably many centuries.

Senator RUSSELL. Let us change—

Mr. WALLACE. If the war came.

Senator RUSSELL. Pardon me.

Mr. WALLACE. If the war came, and by the way, it is incredible to me that Russia would start an aggressive war for many years; she would be utterly foolish if she did, but granted that it would be many years in the future, I would assume that Russia really committed the act of aggression, in that case you would have to look at the situation as it existed at that time.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, to use a hypothetical case, of course, I assume that you include Trieste in your ideas on Greece, that we should pull our troops out of there, or do you; or should we leave the American troops in there?

Mr. WALLACE. Again I go back to the over-all conversation with Stalin.

Senator RUSSELL. To get back away from that for a moment, then, suppose tomorrow Tito were to swamp the small American forces stationed in Trieste, and either kill or capture all of our troops and the British there, and that Russia backed Tito up and attacked our troops in Berlin and in Vienna, and seized those two cities; do you think we would then be justified in dropping the atomic bombs over Russia?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that we would be very foolish so to do. I think your hypothetical question is altogether beyond the realms of reality, however.

Senator RUSSELL. I hope and pray that you are correct in that assumption, sir.

But you think even under those circumstances we would not be justified in using the atomic bomb.

Mr. WALLACE. I say it would be foolish for us to do it.

Senator RUSSELL. Why would it be foolish, Mr. Wallace, if Russia had 350 divisions in her land army and you state we only have 2½? What other hopes would we have of

saving the American people that are over in Germany in the occupation at the present time?

Mr. WALLACE. Simply because that would not save them. That is why I made the statement. That is, Russia would promptly move in within a very few weeks on the way to the British Channel, and dropping bombs in Russia would make it more certain that she would move all the way across. She would do it out of purposes of defense, because she would feel that we would be deterred for a time at least in dropping bombs on the defenseless civilian population of western Europe.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, suppose we were to pull out of Europe tomorrow and follow this policy. Is there any doubt in your mind that Russia would move right in?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. I think Russia has too much good sense to move right in.

Senator RUSSELL. You do not think they would move into any of these troubled areas if we pulled out all of our forces and just said here it is, come and get it, in effect; I do not mean literally inviting them, but pull out all of our people.

Mr. WALLACE. I would not expect Russian troops to move into any of these areas.

Senator RUSSELL. You do not think even in western Germany?

Mr. WALLACE. No, not even western Germany. I think she would be foolish if she did.

Senator RUSSELL. I would like to ask what you think would have happened to any man in Russia who had occupied a high position in the Russian Government if he had expressed the opposition to the policy of the Politburo in Moscow in open meeting that you have expressed here in the United States to these proposals by this administration?

Mr. WALLACE. I have exactly the same views that you have on that subject, Senator.

Senator RUSSELL. You think he would be shot?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know whether he would be shot or sent to Siberia.

Senator RUSSELL. But at least we do have as American citizens that advantage over the people living in Russia.

Mr. WALLACE. We have for the time being. I do not know how long it will last.

Senator RUSSELL. Neither do I.

Those are about the only questions I have to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator WILSON. Senator WILSON. Not for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BYRD.

Senator BYRD. No questions.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would just like to ask Mr. Wallace about two questions.

Mr. Wallace, do you believe that our security in the United States depends in any way upon the peace, or lack of peace, if you will, in Europe? In other words, can we be secure in this country regardless of what goes on in Europe?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think any part of the world can ultimately be secure if some other part of the world is at war.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that we have certain responsibilities in Europe and Asia, your opinion being that the present policies concerning those responsibilities are conducted wrongly; is that it?

Mr. WALLACE. That is it.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But we do have certain responsibilities.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I believe that.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And our security does depend upon how those responsibilities are carried out?

Mr. WALLACE. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that the difference of opinion between you and the present administration which is advocating these policies comes down to a question of means rather than a question of principles, so to speak?

Mr. WALLACE. In brief, I am not an isolationist.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, may I ask you one other question?

You made certain statements which I think are your assumptions rather than any statements of fact. On page 4, for instance, of your statement, you said in the seventh paragraph—

"Under the Forrestal plan still heavier taxes must be imposed, sales tax will be proposed to obtain revenue and cut down relief so that more output can be diverted into military channels."

Then on page 9 you said:

"Thus the strategy is plain—ask for 'only' 3 or 4 billion extra now, then after a few months and a new synthetic crisis, raise the ante to 15 billion, as planned all along."

Those are assumptions or conclusions of yours, rather than any present knowledge of the fact.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; that is correct. I think you are wise to bring that out.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, may I ask one other question, because we are primarily concerned with manpower in connection with our policies. I have not read, I do not think, I may have, I do not remember it, anyway, any of your views with relation to our policy in Japan and Korea. I bring that out because one of the arguments that were made to us is the shortage of manpower at the present time in Korea and Japan.

Do you as a whole approve of the way we have conducted our policy in Japan?

Mr. WALLACE. I regret to say, Senator, that I have not studied the details of our policy in Japan.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that so far as you are concerned, the question of manpower with relation to our needs in Japan in that connection, you make no statement whatsoever.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not making any statement with regard to Japan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Or Korea?

Mr. WALLACE. Or Korea.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, for instance, today on the Senate calendar at this moment now being debated on the Senate floor is the question of our policies in China, and giving relief to Chinese, and also possibly making some funds available for the President to do what he pleases with there, which may mean added munitions, sending more armament to China.

Have you any suggestion concerning that, or any statement or views?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. From what I have seen in China myself, when I was there in 1944, I would say that money we sent to China will be money lost.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Money wasted, in other words.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, money wasted, that the rank and file of the people in China in the Kuomintang area are not for the present regime, and that there is no way in which the present dictatorship, no matter how much it may be strengthened by munitions from the United States, can indefinitely prevent the rank and file of the people from pushing forward to get out of the feudalistic regime.

When I was in China, I did not see any of the Communists. My duty and obligation on that occasion was to deal with the people of the government for specific objectives. I did see certain people in the middle of the road, certain of the professors at various institutions, men who had been trained at Princeton, Harvard, and other outstanding institutions, including my own alma mater.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am glad you brought in mine, too.

Mr. WALLACE. Those men were very much disturbed at the violation of fundamental democratic freedoms.

Since I have been there, two of the professors were assassinated by the secret police of Chiang Kai-shek. One was first assassi-

nated, and the second one was assassinated when or immediately after he delivered the funeral oration.

The ordinary people in China are mostly farm people. Our failure in dealing with the so-called backward economies is that most of our diplomats and makers of policy are not familiar with farm situations, and not familiar with the fact that under the set-up as it has existed in most of these areas, where the farms are small and the land is poor, and the interest rates are high and the rent is high, and our plan of labor will bring in a return of about 5 cents or even less, those people are just not satisfied, because they know it is possible to build up the productivity.

My eyes were first opened to the situation there by a representative of the National City Bank who had been in charge of the branch at Peiping, until the time of Pearl Harbor, and was unable to escape. He came in to see me immediately before I went over to China to give me certain information. He had to escape by way of the Communist territory and lived for some 6 months among the Communists there.

The statement he made to me at that time was that these people were essentially agrarian reformers. Personally I think that they are real Communists, but that was his impression at that time.

I think they are real Communists in their fundamental objectives, although I do not think they are Russian Communists. I think they are Chinese Communists. That is, I think they are patriotic in terms of China, which is not true in all countries, but I do believe it is true there from what I have been able to learn.

At any rate, they have divided up the estates. They have cut down interest rates. They have taught the people to read and write. I got most of this information from this gentleman in 1944, who was with the National City Bank. They have done all of those things.

The point I am making merely is that the Communists, in understanding the agricultural problem in China, have been wiser than we, who also should have understood the agricultural problems. We have greater capacities, as a matter of fact, if we only put our minds to it, to increase productivity, enrich the land, induce better types of machinery, and better types of seeds.

That is essentially the problem in all of these backward areas, and we have let that field be abandoned too largely to the Russians and to the Communists, and if we really wanted to do a job, we should step in and in terms of the needs of the ordinary people.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words, your point, to keep our nose to the grindstone of this bill, your feeling is that our need for additional manpower for purposes in China or our need for additional armament for purposes of selling to the Communists is unwarranted, or is it?

Mr. WALLACE. Our money will be wasted.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And it is going at the question in the wrong way, too.

Mr. WALLACE. It is going at it the wrong way, too.

Senator SALTONSTALL. There is just one more question regarding manpower. We have been talking about any possible conflicts between Russia and ourselves, and you have no feeling regarding the Russians and their methods, and their advances in the eastern part of Korea and Vladivostok and up through that territory. You have no worry about them there at all, so that need for manpower on our part over in those areas is also unnecessary and wrong, is that correct?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, I have not studied Korea and Vladivostok that we are worrying about. That is Russia's own territory.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I mean advancing from there, and so forth, the dangers of attack upon our west coast, put it that way.

Mr. WALLACE. We are talking about submarines.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, I am keeping it general. I do not know any more about submarines than you do.

Mr. WALLACE. I hope you know more about them than the Navy does, apparently.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, what I am trying to get at is, we have certain demands for manpower made on us. You have covered through Senator RUSSELL and Senator GURNEX very thoroughly the European side of it. I was trying to bring out your view on the other side of it.

Mr. WALLACE. Vladivostok is a long way from San Francisco. So far as I know there is no evidence that any Russian submarines have gotten within 5,000 miles of San Francisco. It is a long way from our territorial waters.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words, from our west coast and from the eastern side of the world, you are more of an isolationist than you are on the western side of the world. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I would not say so at all. It is just as important, I would say, for us to do our part in helping the Chinese toward a higher standard of living as it is the western Europe and Balkan states.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That would take some manpower, though, would it not, to do our job correctly?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, to do the job as I would do it, I may say, I am outlining it in a book of mine called *Toward World Peace*, which is just off the press.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Have you given this summary of it here in your statement? Have you given us that?

Mr. WALLACE. I suggest in this book in the first instance until we get to better accord between the United States and Russia that the so-called backward nations should apply to the Economic and Social Council, and to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations for experts to help them in reorganizing, particularly their agriculture, but to some extent their small industries.

That would not cost an awful lot of money, and would not take an awful lot of manpower. It is the same kind of job to some extent that we did through the Farm Security Administration, and that has long been done through the Extension Service. I think it is vitally important for increasing the productivity of the world, and furnishing the fundamental basis for peace.

I do not think it takes tremendous sums of money to do that kind of thing.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words, do you think there would be need for some manpower over there, but less manpower used in a different way?

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wallace, I notice on page 1 of your statement that after 2½ years of reconstruction, its production, meaning Russia, has just regained the prewar level.

I am interested as to that. That is a definite statement. I had not heard from any other source that we had any information as to their production reaching the prewar level.

Mr. WALLACE. I suspect that the sources of information are no more accurate than the sources of information with regard to the 350 divisions; if you wish to have a memorandum on the subject, I will be glad to submit it.

The CHAIRMAN. I will be glad to have it.

Senator RUSSELL. I was also surprised, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Wallace could have such little knowledge of Russia's military strength and stated he knew nothing whatever about their propaganda, but could speak with such assurance that there had not been a submarine within 5,000 miles of our coast.

Mr. WALLACE. I am going merely by what Baldwin and Victor Bernstein report.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wallace, you are definitely in your statement here against selective service for building up the immediate manpower needs of the military as recommended by the Military Establishment. That is right, is it not?

Mr. WALLACE. Beg your pardon, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. You are definitely against selective service at this time?

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And also you are definitely against UMT for the long pull.

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But just as definitely on page 8 of your statement, you say:

"UMT does not prepare trained reserves. It does not lay the ground for an American land force. If we need trained reserves, we now have 15,000,000 veterans of World War II who, as Mr. MARTIN has pointed out, constitute a reserve of trained personnel that will be available for at least 10 more years."

Do you feel it is right, then, to lean on that group of veterans of World War II in case of any emergency?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not anticipate such an emergency, but I say we have them there as an insurance if the case of need should arise.

The CHAIRMAN. You are definitely against any program to build up any other reserve, so therefore you personally are relying on those reserves right there.

Mr. WALLACE. Standing on the statement I just made.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the statement, yes. I can understand how you as a nonveteran would make that statement.

Senator HILL.

Senator HILL. Mr. Wallace, in 1940 you were a member of our Government. You were in the President's Cabinet. You supported the defense program at that time, did you not?

Mr. WALLACE. I supported it very, very strongly, sir.

Senator HILL. Very strongly; and why?

Mr. WALLACE. Because I felt that we were in grave danger of having Hitler dominate this country.

Senator HILL. You see no danger at all from Russia and communistic Russia at this time?

Mr. WALLACE. I see no danger whatever to this country at this time from either Russia or communism.

Senator HILL. You entirely differentiate then between Hitler and nazism, and Stalin and communistic aggression.

Mr. WALLACE. I do completely, sir. I am in accord with the United States Army in that respect. I will give you this. It is a publication put out by the United States Army, entitled "Our Ally, Russia."

Senator HILL. What is the date of that?

Mr. WALLACE. That, I believe, was 1944.

Senator HILL. 1944. Well, things have changed quite a bit since 1944, have they not?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, but I would like to read this statement to you, Senator, because if the Army did not believe what it was saying then, it was just putting out this for propaganda purposes, for soft-soaping an ally that was serving our need temporarily. We ought to know it, I think.

Senator HILL. Read it.

Mr. WALLACE. So I think it would be well to read it into the record. The question asked in this publication, *Our Ally, Russia*, is: Are not Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union the same? Then it goes ahead and answers the question:

"Some people who talk faster than they think would say yes. After all, both are dictatorships. But there are many differences, and they happen to be important differences. The Nazi idea is that Germany and the whole world must be ruled by a little clique of greedy men for the benefit of a small group. This clique never intends to relinquish its power. It is not interested

in improving the lot of the ordinary people. It is interested only in war, plunder, and world power. And the Soviet idea is that the dictatorship must serve the people. There is no master race idea in the Soviet Union. All people are considered equal. Working conditions were constantly being improved before the war, at a time when the Nazis were ruthlessly destroying the German labor unions and turning their own people into slave laborers. The Soviet Government raised the status of women to equality with men, while the Nazis considered women fit only to breed children. The Soviet Government increased the number of school children by 400 percent and of college students by 800 percent, while the Nazis cut the number of students in Germany by more than half. The Soviet Government has as its goal the building of a better, happier country for its people. The Nazi government has as its goal the building of a powerful war machine that will plunder the world to enrich Germany."

The Army put forth at that time a great many other statements of that general character, and apparently in the main, I would not say exclusively by any manner of means, because there were many people in the Army that did not hold those views, but in the main, as long as Roosevelt was alive, the Army had that kind of an attitude.

After Roosevelt died, the Army attitude changed completely.

Senator HILL. It was not the death of Roosevelt, but it was the acts, the subsequent acts of Russia that caused people to change their opinions.

Mr. WALLACE. I would not undertake to differentiate.

Senator HILL. You would not condemn Russian aggression. The close of the war changes your opinion no way whatever toward Russia?

Mr. WALLACE. Let us get right down to what we are concerned with. Suppose Russia is everything that you want to say she is. We will assume that you have said everything against Russia that is in your mind, and that is the record. I still say that we here in the United States at the present time, in view of the power realities of the next 10 years, are not warranted in taking this step to draft our boys.

Senator HILL. Well, then, you say that assume Russia is everything that some say she is, everything her actions would indicate she is, you still see no danger whatever between the United States and Russia.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I do not.

Senator HILL. No threat at all there.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not.

Senator HILL. If Russia took over all of Europe, it would be the same thing, would it?

Mr. WALLACE. No, sir; I do not say that.

Senator HILL. You would not say that. Well, you just would sit by and see whether she would take it.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say this. I do not know whether you read the speech I made on September 12, 1946, or not, but at that time I indicated a possible modus vivendi with Russia, and I may say that the President went over the speech at the time, and I think he was sold on my approach at the time he went over my speech with me.

Since then we have followed the get-tough policy, and as the result of the get-tough policy, Russia and communism have gotten stronger. I would say that the possibility, I would say that the methods we have used have served to strengthen Russia and communism in the whole world, not to weaken her, and that the more we use these methods, the more we will lose the sympathy of the rank and file of the ordinary people all over the world, and the more communism will be strengthened. I think human nature is made that way.

Senator HILL. We have changed our policy because we found that appeasement was not

getting us anywhere with Russia; did we not? Did we not find that the more we gave, the more they demanded?

Mr. WALLACE. I would suggest, Senator, you ask your old friend Senator Byrnes; I may have been misinformed with regard to the last conversations he had with Molotov in December of 1946, but as I remember it, just before he ceased being Secretary of State he had great hopes for the next time when he met with Molotov, because he found Molotov being much more reasonable in December of 1946 than he expected.

Senator HILL. I do not think he said anything about that in his book, did he, speaking frankly?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, maybe he did not. Ask him about it personally off the record.

Senator HILL. Well, I think you will find that he found the more he gave, the more they demanded, and I am rather surprised that you would come here to defend your position today with a statement issued by the Army in 1944, in view of all that Russia has done, all of the many acts of aggression on her part since 1944.

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, if you will just reverse the situation, if you will just reverse it, put yourself in the other position, if you had seen the United States destroyed all the way from the Atlantic seaboard up to Gary, Ind., all the various factories, all of the various factories, I repeat, 10,000,000 of our people killed, all of the livestock driven off, practically all of the farm homes destroyed, and then if you had seen, if you had all of that happen, and a foreign power then came close to your very borders with bases, many bases, air bases, close to your borders, I think you would try to use whatever mechanisms you had, any possible mechanisms you had, to stop that kind of a situation.

Senator HILL. To reach out and take others.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that this method of answering tit for tat is leading irrevocably to war which Russia certainly cannot win, but neither can we.

Senator HILL. That justifies Russian aggression; is what you mean?

Mr. WALLACE. No, I would say that I am not justifying anybody. I am just simply explaining how people get that way.

Senator HILL. Do you not think that we went in the UN with an idea of working this peace out with Russia, as well as with all of the other nations, and that all we have gotten, practically all we have gotten from Russia has been a rebuff, and unwillingness to agree, and unwillingness to reach any mutual understanding?

Mr. WALLACE. I should say that we were headed toward eventual peaceful understanding as long as Roosevelt was alive. When Roosevelt died the whole thing changed. The military took control.

Senator HILL. Of course you have to realize that Mr. Roosevelt died before even VJ-day, do you not, before the war was over with, when Russia was still in danger, was still needing our help, was still getting help from us.

Mr. WALLACE. And we wanted her help very much, too.

Senator HILL. We wanted her to continue in the war. That is perhaps true. But the change came when Russia was no longer in danger, is that not true? The change came when the war ended.

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, I will not attempt to assess blame. All I am interested in is in the future and in peace. I do not think there is any possible good comes out of trying to assess blame or call people names.

Senator HILL. I agree with you thoroughly. Nothing comes out of that. But you have to look at past acts if we are to judge the future. And our portion for the future. If you adjudge the motives of men and the courses of men, the direction they are taking, of nations the same way, you can only

judge them by their acts, not by their so-called declarations, perhaps.

What I am judging Russia by, and the thing that interests me, is that you do not seem to consider at all her actions since the war, since VJ-day, her aggressions to other people.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that both nations have been taking actions which lead to war, and that we have got to reverse that policy.

Senator HILL. Would you put us in the same class with Russia?

Mr. WALLACE. I will not attempt to make exact measurements. I will say that both nations have been engaged in acts which lead to war.

Senator HILL. You spoke several times of the atomic bomb. Do you not think we made a very fine effort to reach an agreement on the bomb when we had the secret, and we were willing to turn it over to the world, provided we knew it would not be used against us?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I do not think so.

Senator HILL. You do not think so?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I did not think so, and judging from the recent statement by Mr. Bernard, he did not think so either, and neither did Mr. Lillenthal. If that statement that appeared in the press is correct, he thought it would lead to an inevitable destruction.

Senator HILL. You mean Mr. Baruch?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I am talking about Mr. Bernard, who recently became head of the Rockefeller Foundation, who was a member of the Commission at that time, with Mr. Baruch, Mr. Lillenthal, and I have forgotten the names of the other members at the moment.

Senator HILL. Then you think it is about as much our fault as it is Russia's fault?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that the blame is not all on one side, and the quicker we appreciate that, the more quickly we are to have peace.

Senator HILL. But you see no threat to us from Russian communism today?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I see no threat to us from Russian communism today.

Senator MORSE. I would like to ask two or three questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MORSE.

Senator MORSE. I want to say at the outset that the foundation of my questions is the first paragraph of your statement this afternoon, consisting of those three short sentences, with which I am in complete agreement.

I think you set out there objectives that we are striving for and the foundation of my question is based on those paragraphs.

"The American people want peace. They want lasting peace achieved through world cooperation in the United Nations. They want a strong and prosperous America."

Then I want to say most respectfully that following that statement I think we proceed in argument based upon a series of assumptions in regard to which I desire facts and my questions are related only to those assumptions because I am going to continue to insist, as far as my position on this legislation is concerned, that we get the facts.

On the first page you say, "but the security of the United States is not threatened." I assume by that you mean that as of now the territorial security of the United States is not threatened?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. Well, I also am concerned about the security of certain ideals, certain philosophical objectives upon which democracy either has to rest or is going to fall. So, my line of questioning is whether or not those ideals, sometimes referred to as those conceptions of liberty and freedom we think are essential so that men as individuals may remain free in this world, are threatened by Russian policy.

I think to paraphrase you a moment ago, let us get down to the brass tacks of the situation, the problem is a Russian-American problem. We are not going to have peace until the solution of that problem.

As I read through these assumptions I find that my questions can best be based on the periodical that you have seen fit to quote today, which I seldom quote. However, when there is something which I feel is right I do not fail to quote it. I refer to an article by Chamberlin in the Wall Street Journal of this morning, if the chairman will permit me, because I want to use these three paragraphs for the basis of my questioning.

I want to read them to you because I think that there is where we come to grips with the problems as to these philosophical concepts of democracy that are in danger as far as Russian policy is concerned.

Mr. WALLACE. Which Chamberlin do you have reference to?

Senator MORSE. William Henry Chamberlin, and the item is entitled, "Appeasement has not stopped Russian expansion which now takes in large areas in Europe and Asia."

I am interested only in the ideas expressed, irrespective of other ideas he may have.

"There are at least four such reasons which may be briefly summarized as follows:

"1. The fatalistic belief of Soviet statesmen; set down over and over again in the writings of Lenin and Stalin, that true peace and security can come only as a result of a triumphant world Communist revolution."

Do you think, Mr. Wallace, that that is an accurate statement of the political objectives and the teachings of both Lenin and Stalin?

Mr. WALLACE. I refuse to comment on any writings by William Henry Chamberlin.

Senator MORSE. Well, suppose that we eliminate his name?

Mr. WALLACE. That is, I do not wish to deal in ad hominem remarks of any kind, and I do not care to comment on anything he may say.

Senator MORSE. I know you do not, but suppose we take his name off and make them my statements? I will put the language in my language and ask the question as to whether or not in your opinion the writings of Lenin and Stalin as far as the political objectives of Soviet Russia are concerned lay down the program of world Communist revolution?

Mr. WALLACE. It is quite correct, sir, that back in the early twenties, both Lenin and Stalin made very extreme statements as to what they regarded as to the inevitable ultimate course of events and the desirable course of events.

In other words, in those days both Lenin and Stalin spoke for the eventual triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat in all of the nations of the world. I think there is no gainsaying that.

Senator MORSE. Would you agree, Mr. Wallace, that the fact that that is historical background has caused tremendous fear in America among the American people or millions of them as to Russia's world political objectives?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that a very great disservice has been rendered the people of the United States by playing up those statements of Lenin and Stalin which were made under the stress of an extraordinary revolutionary situation, where there had been intervention by many countries in the internal affairs of Russia, millions of lives of the Russian people had been lost as a result of that intervention in the early twenties, the conniving had been of an extreme nature. You can read the history on that and discover just exactly the nature of the conniving as Britain drove for the oil fields of Baku, and various other people and Japan tried to make their objectives and, although the United States had a little cleaner bill of health than the rest, it was really pretty bad.

I would say that they had extreme provocation at that time and also they were proba-

bly moved by, you might say, a purely doctrinaire expression of what they approved to be true Marxism.

I do not think it contributes to the peace of the world to emphasize those statements at the present time because Stalin last year specifically took those statements back and came out for a *modus vivendi* with the United States when he gave interviews to Alexander Worth, a British newspaperman, to Harold Stassen and to Elliott Roosevelt. Moreover, it is also a part of history that after the death of Lenin, Trotsky was preaching the inevitable world revolution and Stalin, instead of preaching inevitable world revolution, came out for the strengthening of communism of Russia; that a Socialist state could be built in one country; that you did not have to have the whole world socialized in order to build it.

Trotsky felt that you had to have capital from other countries in order to get Russia off dead center and moving into the scheme of things. Stalin had a limited objective and in effect he took it out of the hide of the Russian people by very extraordinary measures.

I did not like those measures at the time at all, referring particularly to the liquidation of the Kulaks in 1932 and 1933, I did not like them at all. I remember when I was passing through Soviet Russia to China in 1934 and I discussed that particular matter with the man assigned to accompany me through Russian territory from the Russian foreign office and he made this point which in a way was a well-developed point.

I visited some of these collective farms in Siberia; that if Russia had not under Stalin's leadership moved decisively to get the farms on a more practical basis, that it would have been impossible to remove the labor to make that extraordinary development in Russia during the thirties and if that had not been done Russia would undoubtedly have been defeated. That is no excuse for the liquidation of the Kulaks where human values were sacrificed in a way we do not like, but I do say that it saved the lives, undoubtedly, of many hundreds of thousands of American boys that Russia was able to withstand Germany and we did not have to fight by ourselves.

Senator MORSE. Would you say, Mr. Wallace, then, that you think it would be a correct statement of fact to give to the American people today that the present Soviet Government does not have as one of its world political objectives communistic revolutions in other countries.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is impossible to speak for all of the Russians in that respect. Stalin may have one view and other members of the Polit Bureau may have another. I doubt if there is a completely unified attitude such as we might be led to expect. We have many views in this country, goodness knows, in our top leadership.

Senator MORSE. I think you will agree with me, will you not, that fear itself can be a fact, one of the facts you have to deal with when you are dealing with relations between two countries; and I think it is an important fact trying to find a peaceful solution to present difficulties between the United States and Russia.

I am going to put my question this way because to me it is an important question. Do you agree with me that as long as many American people fear that Russia's world political objective is to communize at least some countries, if not the world, that that fear is a fact which must be tackled?

Mr. WALLACE. Let us put it this way: I was in Europe last spring a year ago and I was in Europe again last fall, and in a number of different countries. I would say that fear was very much in their minds and that their fear was of this nature. I think this applies to the large part of the people of the world.

The fear is of this nature, that the United States, believing in the inevitable and de-

sirable triumph of capitalism all over the world will come into conflict with a Russia that believes as you state and therefore these people who desperately desire peace more intensely even than the people of the United States, because they have had first-hand experience with occupying armies, they are very fearful that they will be ground between the upper and the nether millstone. The fear is one that goes both ways, both doctrines in the eyes of these people stand out and is tending to be dominating.

What I am pleading for is *modus vivendi* between the two and not a head-on conflict between the two.

Senator MORSE. Assume for the moment the existence of these two fears, the fears of our people and the fears of Europe. Referring to your statement in your testimony that our security is not threatened, would you deny that these principles of individual liberty, freedom of choice, and protection of the dignity of the individual which are basic to our American system, are not protected and to a large extent are not existent under a communistic society?

Mr. WALLACE. It is true with regard to Russia. I do not know to what extent it is true in the communistic area of north China; that is, I do not care to generalize.

Senator MORSE. It is true of Russian communism as it exists in Russia?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Senator MORSE. Which leads me to this question: As Russia expands her territorial jurisdiction as she has in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans—

Mr. WALLACE. I do not agree to that statement that she has expanded her territorial jurisdiction in those particular countries.

Senator MORSE. Let us pause on that one for a moment then because again I think we are dealing with a question of fact that again has created tremendous fears and misunderstandings; if it is not a fact and is also basic to trying to find the reasons for the demand now for universal military training and for the draft, because after all they are simply the products, it seems to me, of the fears that have been developed in this country, and I am trying to find the factual basis for the fear.

Is it your opinion that the policy which Russia has followed in Poland and Czechoslovakia and the satellite countries since VE-day is a policy that ought to be accepted by the United States as a policy not jeopardizing any of these democratic principles to which I have alluded?

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to get the full information with regard to just what has been done in those various countries. I think that ought to be entered into our record as to just what exactly has been done in those countries. I think you ought to get it from impartial sources.

For instance, some of you may have tuned in on the broadcast of Mr. Smith, who broadcast on Sunday, in which he said there were more Americans at the time of the coup in Czechoslovakia than there were Russians. There were more American soldiers, they were there on leave, but there were more American soldiers than Russian soldiers. There were apparently few Russian soldiers at the time according to Mr. Smith, and that is contrary to the opinion customarily expressed.

Then I would suggest you might read a statement made by Mr. Dick Crossman in the *New Statesman and Nation*, it is a British publication. Mr. Crossman is a member of Parliament who during the past 6 months has gone along with Ernest Bevin. He is alarmed on the whole about Russia but he apparently had just returned from Czechoslovakia and his statement I think you will find very illuminating. You will find it in the Congressional Library, undoubtedly.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Wallace, I certainly agree with you that we ought to find the facts and we have not the facts as yet.

Mr. WALLACE. Dick Crossman was a former Oxford man and he is something of a scholar and I believe he has taught the classics. While he is quite a rightist in the British labor politics, he is an objective observer on the whole.

Senator MORSE. I say we should weigh any facts that any of those men you mentioned can offer us but is it not true that the primary reason why you and I cannot sit here this afternoon and speak with absolute certainty as to what the absolute facts are is because of the Soviet's policy of making facts behind the iron curtain inaccessible to us?

Mr. WALLACE. I think the word "curtain" which was started by Mr. Winston Churchill at Fulton, Mo., has done an irreparable damage to the cause of world peace. The Czechoslovaks, for example, were continually joking about the iron curtain, asking the Americans to point out to them 3 months ago, just where the curtain was. I venture if you go there today you will find them joking and asking where the curtain is.

Senator BALDWIN. They know now.

Mr. WALLACE. I suggested that you go and find out.

Senator MORSE. We tried to get visas and passports into countries dominated by Russia.

Mr. WALLACE. Have you tried to get a visa into Czechoslovakia?

Senator MORSE. I have tried to get a visa into Czechoslovakia and you would be surprised the number of difficulties they are able to put in the way even after you get into Berlin to get into a satellite Russian country if they do not want you in there.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course, I have no doubt that if they are convinced that if you are going in there for a specific purpose they will interpose objections.

Senator MORSE. I think that just the purpose of observation is all the purpose they need; that has been my experience with them.

I have one other line of questioning. I want to leave that one with this statement. I think that if we intellectually honest men are going to try to get the facts to eliminate the cause of these fears we cannot escape one fact that the Russian policy—and I will eliminate the word "curtain"—the Russian policy of nonaccessibility, as far as free interchange of ideas and the people going into these countries is concerned, has created all of these fears.

Mr. WALLACE. I will agree with you wholeheartedly that it has created these fears with Russia herself. I think it is unfortunate that Russia has not seen fit to allow us to talk freely with her people.

I will not say it as an excuse for Russia but merely as an explanation that it does measure the very great depth of her fear of us, the fact that she will not allow her people to talk to any foreigner. I think that is a horrible reflection on the state of the world today.

Senator MORSE. I want to ask you a question on the second sentence in that first paragraph, "they want lasting peace achieved through world cooperation in the United Nations."

Is it your considered judgment that the Russian exercise of the veto power, her record that she has made, as far as cooperation and noncooperation with the United States is concerned, has not been a factor in creating the situation in this country which is causing us now to think of legislation for universal military training?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, an examination of Russia's use of the veto power would require a great deal of research. It is not the excessive thing that is indicated in the American press. If you conduct a careful scholarly, legal study without prejudice I think you will find that to be true.

Senator MORSE. You do not think that her exercise of the veto, the policy that she has followed in these other countries that I have mentioned, in any way placed in

jeopardy the security of these ideals of democracy to which I have referred?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I think to some degree they have; I do not think there is any question about that. I am merely saying that the full truth has not been told about it.

Senator MORSE. Your constructive offer to the committee as to the first step we ought to take in lieu of any of this legislation is to seek a conference with the Russian leaders in an endeavor to reach some over-all agreement, I think your phrase was, in regard to world peace.

Now, what assurance can you give me on the basis of conferences of the past and the record of Stalin and the other members of his group that any successful negotiations could be carried on in developing such an over-all plan in the absence of getting this country in a military position powerful enough so that he would understand that we intended to enforce the peace?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think you can, by the military route, get the peace you are seeking for. If you have 10 times the force you have today, I say you still will not get the peace you are looking for.

As a matter of fact, I will say you are much less likely to have the peace you are looking for because people do not respond to force in that way; they never have and never will. You just cannot go at it in that manner.

Senator MORSE. Do you not think that because of the position that England and the United States and France were in at the time of Munich was an inducement to Hitler to continue with his march?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, that is a very complicated situation there.

Senator MORSE. I know; the whole thing is complicated.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course, in that case Hitler was very definitely the aggressor, there is no question about that.

Senator MORSE. You and I may disagree as to whether Stalin is the aggressor on the policy he has followed in the satellite countries, but it looks to me like another march and that is what I am afraid of.

Mr. WALLACE. I just disagree with you there.

Senator MORSE. I have no other question, Mr. Chairman, other than to say that I appreciate the witness facing the issue. As far as my interest is concerned, if I were concerned as to whether democratic ideals are endangered by Russian present policy, I think they are greatly in danger. It seems to me that we cannot avoid taking some steps, manpower steps, to keep ourselves sufficiently strong so that when we do negotiate with Russia, if we are able to negotiate, we will be able to enforce the peace.

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, I would like to make a further comment with regard to your approach, that if we attempt to bring Russia to terms in the manner you suggest, we shall find perhaps this year we have an over-all appropriation, this coming fiscal year for all purposes of containing Russia, of say, \$25,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe Senator MAYBANK has a question.

Mr. WALLACE. Could I complete my comment?

The following year they will expend up to perhaps \$40,000,000,000 and that will continually breed upon itself and it is quite conceivable that the Russian economists knowing the ultimate effectiveness on the economy in terms of inflation, in terms of unbalanced budget, would like to continue to needle us in this way, that way, and the other way into a position which ultimately will be a very weak position.

Remember, the Russians are chess players.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Wallace, if that assumption is true I do not think you are reconciling your statement to what you say in your prepared statement.

Senator MAYBANK. I just wanted to ask Mr. Wallace a question because he was talking

about Czechoslovakia. The other day I read in the paper that you said our Ambassador, Steinhart, engineered the coup there. I wondered if you had any definite information that you base that on or is it a résumé of things such as you reviewed a while ago that you heard on the radio?

Mr. WALLACE. The statement there came up at a press conference and came up in a piecemeal fashion. The rightist ministers in the Czechoslovakian cabinet along about the middle of February raised certain issues, I have forgotten the details of the issues, with regard to I think the appointments by the police chiefs somewhere in a certain area, and said that if this particular issue of these appointments by a police chief in a certain area were not taken care of they would resign. The matter went along and Ambassador Steinhart was in this country and got back, I think, on the 19th of February.

On the 20th of February he invited Czechoslovakia to come into the Marshall plan. With the crisis that existed in Czechoslovakia at that time a statement by the Ambassador, American Ambassador, inviting Czechoslovakia to come into the Marshall plan could not be looked on favorably by the Russians.

I realize many people have different opinions on this but this is my analysis of it and it could not have other than the effect of causing all the leftist groups in Czechoslovakia to feel that the United States was doing the same thing that she had done in Italy and in France in forcing the left-wing groups out of the government.

Therefore, when the rightists did resign on February 20, they immediately moved in. I said that Ambassador Steinhart was responsible. I do not know whether I put in the words, "to some degree," but I should put them because this was a very hasty conference and it was not the main subject under consideration. He was to some degree responsible for the situation the way it finally resulted, I will put it this way.

The newspapermen brought back that we had hoped that the same objectives would be obtained in Czechoslovakia as had been obtained in Italy and France; that the Communist members would be kicked out of the Government. We can say that from our point of view that would be a highly desirable thing and we ought to get to do everything we can to get Communists out of the Government, but when you have a country where Communists have 38 percent of the votes in the preceding election, if we do believe in democracy at all, and at that time Czechoslovakia was a democracy in the western sense, if you do believe in democracy you do believe that they are entitled to some representation.

Senator MAYBANK. But the only specific thing that the ambassador did was to invite them to come in on the Marshall plan?

Mr. WALLACE. To come into the Marshall plan on that particular day; that is the point that I made.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BALDWIN.

Senator BALDWIN. Mr. Wallace, you were just discussing the term "democracy." Would it be, in your opinion, that if the people of Czechoslovakia were to choose a government and a Communist regime and thereafter be unable to change it would that be a democracy?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that if any country embarked on a regime which it never thereafter could change, that that could not be a democracy.

Senator BALDWIN. I am glad to hear you say that because that is my conception of it, too. In other words, if by the democratic process the people passing upon themselves a regime that they never can thereafter change by the democratic process, then they do not have a democracy.

Mr. WALLACE. That is my understanding, sir.

Senator BALDWIN. I remember that Abraham Lincoln once said that "if we knew where we were or where we were going, we would know better what to do."

I would want to preface with a statement to the effect that on this confused state of affairs many people have different views and you are entitled to yours as well as anybody else is entitled to his. That in turn is the working of the process of democracy.

I am wondering if a people, such as the people of the United States, see Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, the Balkan states, Poland, and Czechoslovakia taken into Communist regimes, if they are not entitled from that series of events to wonder whether or not their own institutions and the institutions of their former friends and allies are not being threatened.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not conclude that their institutions and their former friends and allies are being threatened.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, would you say that the acts of Russia to date, to judge from what has happened in these other countries, indicate that she has pursued a policy of aggression or that communism has pursued a policy of aggression?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I would not say that Russia had pursued a policy of aggression.

Senator BALDWIN. You do not think that Russia has pursued in any respect a policy of aggression?

Mr. WALLACE. I think that Russia has merely—mind you, it is not my objective to defend Russia.

Senator BALDWIN. I know, but what we have to do is to adopt policies and lay plans upon what we see, what we hear, and what we can fairly believe to be the facts; do we not?

Mr. WALLACE. I think we have to face this problem as realistically as we can. I think you have to realize this, that Russia having suffered in the way I previously described, and having been invaded century after century via those level plains on her western border, was certain to do everything possible to get friendly governments in all the nations that bordered her on the west.

Senator BALDWIN. But you would not think that in the process of doing that she had been aggressive in any way, shape, or manner?

Mr. WALLACE. When you say "any way, shape, or manner," possibly here or possibly there.

Senator BALDWIN. "Possibly here or possibly there," would you mind mentioning where?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, with regard to Czechoslovakia, I do not know of any proof that exists except the presence of Mr. Zorin, I believe, in Czechoslovakia. So far as I know he was the only Russian that was in Czechoslovakia actively at work at the time of the coup.

Dick Crossman, in his article in the New Statesman, mentioned that Mr. Zorin had a meeting with one particular person, a Mr. Lausman, I think it was. Mr. Crossman may not be completely informed, but that was the best information apparently that he could get while he was there. He makes the point that Russia was not active in the coup there except that there was this fact that there was in the background—Mr. Crossman's analysis—there was in the background the fact of this tremendous military power, which is Russia, that was close to the Czechoslovakian boundary.

Senator BALDWIN. In other words, your answer is that Russia did not do any more than she needed to do to accomplish her purpose?

Mr. WALLACE. Frankly, I think it is a question of geography; that the influence of both Russia and the United States varies almost inversely with the distance. While the United States probably did everything she could there, yet we were so far away from home that what we did there did not count for as much as Russia did.

In other words, it is a point that is made right along that Russia with one unit of energy along her borders can do 5 or 10 times as much as we can.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, she has geography on her side.

Mr. WALLACE. She has geography on her side.

Senator BALDWIN. That is what makes it easier.

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

Senator BALDWIN. But you want to be recorded as saying that you do not think Russia has followed a policy of aggression or that communism has followed that line?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know the full details there. I happened to read the statement of Crossman with regard to Czechoslovakia day before yesterday and have it in mind.

With regard to Poland, I do not know anything particularly; I do not know of anything aggressive that she has done in Poland.

With regard to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, they were a part of Russia before World War I and Russia apparently for security reasons deliberately took them back again. She was forced, apparently, to give them up after World War I because of an internal situation. You can say that that was aggressive and I will agree with you she took them over.

Senator BALDWIN. In other words, as an American citizen, you do not feel that Russian conduct and Communist conduct toward these countries that have gradually been drawn behind the iron curtain is anything that should cause apprehension?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that it was a situation that was inevitable; that, frankly, was the point of my speech of September 12, 1946; that we should recognize the inevitability of the geographical situation and start with that. I think if we are going to fight for our type of democracy in the Balkans we will be fighting a long way from home, fighting to get something for people who have never enjoyed democracy in our sense of the term.

I will make the one exception for Czechoslovakia, which undoubtedly did enjoy democracy in our sense of the term.

Senator BALDWIN. As I understood it, what we were fighting this war for was aptly and perfectly expressed in the Atlantic Charter, to which I understood you subscribed?

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly.

Senator BALDWIN. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom from fear, and freedom to worship. Do you think we have that in any of these countries that have been drawn behind the curtain?

Mr. WALLACE. I think there is freedom to worship in practically all of these countries.

Senator BALDWIN. But there is not any freedom of speech and press and freedom from fear?

Mr. WALLACE. There is not freedom of speech or freedom of the press in Russia, certainly. As to how much there is in the other countries—and probably not in Yugoslavia—as to how much there is in the other countries, I think would take a detailed and careful survey to discover just how much there is.

Senator BALDWIN. You mentioned the possibilities of this survey, and you mentioned the possibilities of a meeting with Premier Stalin to work out a basis of agreement. Would you not think that one of the first things that we ought to insist upon is a free exchange of knowledge and ideas and news from our respective countries to one another? Would not that be a great help toward bringing about an understanding relationship?

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly it would be a great help; but I would say this—that you cannot do so with Russia in her present frame of mind and with her present very difficult economic situation and her very great fears, which are immensely more than ours; that you cannot hope, as long as she suspects

that we are trying to do to her what the western nations did try to do to her in 1919, 1920, and 1921—you cannot expect to get anything of this sort out of her until those fears are arrested and she has confidence that we do not have an aggressive objective for destroying her form of government.

She believes that we are out to destroy it, and she has every reason to, in view of the recent statements of President Truman.

Senator BALDWIN. What opportunities has she given us today to have us demonstrate to her beyond what we have already demonstrated that that is not our intention? Have we had the opportunity?

Mr. WALLACE. We certainly have not demonstrated it at the present time.

Senator BALDWIN. May I ask you this question: Mr. Wallace, a moment ago you drew an interesting parallel in which you said, "put us in their place."

Supposing the United States had been invaded by a hostile enemy and that the whole country to a line drawn from Gary, Ind., to Birmingham, Ala., had been laid waste. Then supposing Russia had given us \$11,000,000,000 worth of equipment with which to fight; supposing Russia had withdrawn the greatest military force that had ever been assembled in history, that was right on her borders and ready if there were any militaristic purposes to strike, and had yet withdrawn that force; supposing Russia had continued to make overtures, as we have tried to do, tried to internationalize the use of atomic energy and lay bare the secrets of the atomic bomb upon certain commitments of international control. What do you think would have been the reaction of the American people toward Russia?

You think it would be the same as the Russian Government has indicated toward us?

Mr. WALLACE. I think if it had been done in the way that we did it, we would be very suspicious.

Senator BALDWIN. In other words, we have given away \$11,000,000,000 and we have made all these overtures in the wrong manner?

Mr. WALLACE. No; let me say this: I happen to know something about the \$11,000,000,000. We gave it under lend-lease to Russia, stating specifically to Russia—I do not know whether this is a matter of writing or not, but I know it was done this way—stating to Russia that we were doing it to save ourselves and not for the sake of Russia. We made that very clear to her at the time. We believed that it was saving the lives of our American boys.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, we did, and we were entitled to believe that. It also shortened the war as far as Russia was concerned, did it not?

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, as illustrated by these Army documents, all the time the war was on we were preaching the greatest friendship and understanding.

Senator BALDWIN. Do you not think we were sincere in it?

Mr. WALLACE. That is what I would like to know.

Senator BALDWIN. I would like to think we were. I think most Americans feel that way.

Mr. WALLACE. I think insofar as President Roosevelt had anything to do in determining these various pamphlets issued at that time to the Army, that he was sincere in it.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, I would like to read a statement in regard to former President Roosevelt that seems to be very apt right here: "Roosevelt believed in peace through preparedness, that preparedness was meant for peace."

It seems to me that that is pretty much our policy now, to try to get ready to meet any eventuality, is it not? Could it not be interpreted as such?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, you can lift statements of that sort out of context; but undoubtedly Roosevelt was, as the war drew toward a

close, thinking more and more about attaining peace in other ways than through preparedness. Especially so, if he had known that the atomic bomb was coming, he would have felt that to a greater degree.

The atomic bomb means that the only safety, the only security for the United States, the only sound military policy, is that understanding between the United States and Russia which will give a strong United Nations with a police force for the United Nations stronger than that of any individual nation.

Senator BALDWIN. I think that is the thing we have to work for; but, going back to this reference to Mr. Roosevelt and the atomic bomb. As a member of that Commission, you do not mean to imply that President Roosevelt did not know that the atomic bomb was coming into existence?

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Senator BALDWIN. He did anticipate that it might have to be used as a weapon in war; that was the reason for the haste in getting it.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course, nobody knew until the bomb was dropped in New Mexico that it would work. I knew early in the game, and I was one of the few people that did know, about the efforts to obtain the atomic bomb, but I do not have any assurance whatsoever that Roosevelt would have used the atomic bomb in the way it was ultimately used.

Senator BALDWIN. Would you subscribe to this statement, thinking of it in terms of today?

"But we must face the fact that the dictators have definite designs against this hemisphere. Their tactics here, as in Europe, are to divide and conquer. They hope by propaganda and bartering agreements to set one nation against another. They hope to set each class against another class. They inspire a multitude of angry voices in every democratic nation. Out of the confusion which they have created they hope to build political power and eventually military power."

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly that is what Hitler was up to.

Senator BALDWIN. Would you subscribe to that statement?

Mr. WALLACE. Not with regard to the present situation. I would say that it could rapidly get into that position. I would say that it is dangerously close to that position now. I would say that as long as we are creating this fear in Russia that there is danger that Russia will do what you describe there.

Senator BALDWIN. You do not think Russians have any designs against this hemisphere?

Mr. WALLACE. I think as long as we are using our present methods they are going to create nuisance values wherever they can.

Senator BALDWIN. Do you think they have designs against this hemisphere?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know how anybody can answer what communism is any more than you can say what the Democratic Party is.

Senator BALDWIN. That is a hard thing to answer now, I will admit.

Mr. WALLACE. It is equally hard to say what the Republican Party is saying.

Senator BALDWIN. That has been true at times; I will admit that.

Mr. WALLACE. But communism, undoubtedly, is a different thing in China from what it is in some other places.

Senator BALDWIN. Taking it generally—this idea that Senator MORSE brought out so well about world revolution—do you think that there is any danger in the Western Hemisphere of any such thing happening?

Do you think there is any design to have it happen?

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, no; I would not think there could be a design, for the simple reason that Russia would be utterly foolish to move in as Russia did into western Europe. Now,

enthusiastic local Communists may do their best to get control for communism, but Russia certainly has enough good sense to know that as a controlling power she cannot move farther west than she now is.

Senator BALDWIN. I certainly share that hope with you, but it does seem to me that we are lacking evidence.

Mr. WALLACE. She would be utterly and completely overplaying her hand; it would expose her to the same kind of weakness that I think we are exposing ourselves to.

Senator BALDWIN. That is a matter of opinion.

Here is another statement which I would like to quote, and it reads:

"Between now and November, I propose to do everything I can to arouse the American people to the need for peace through preparedness, to the importance of the solidarity of the Americas, and to the duty of businessmen, workers, and farmers to cooperate together for full employment and for the national defense."

Would you subscribe to that?

Mr. WALLACE. That sounds like something I said in 1940.

Senator BALDWIN. It certainly was something you said in 1940, and so was the other statement something you said in 1940, but you do not subscribe to them now?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think Russia is the same as Hitler; I just do not believe it.

Senator BALDWIN. I would like to read another statement to you which came from a very sincere witness before this committee, because of one of the questions that we have before us here is: Are we justified in going ahead? [Reading:]

"The whole aim and effort of the United States is to attain the objective of peace to prevent differences between nations developing into armed conflict until the United Nations has gained a maturity in both a moral and physical force with which to deal with any international act of aggression. In the meantime it must be made clear and manifest to the world that any nation which tries to copy the pattern of action which through Hitler brought so much disaster on mankind, must, like Hitler and Germany, face the determination and will of the United States that it shall not happen again."

Mr. WALLACE. Who was that?

Senator BALDWIN. Would you subscribe to that?

Mr. WALLACE. Who was that?

Senator BALDWIN. I am asking you. Your opinion, Mr. Wallace, as to principles should not be affected by who states them.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I would like to know who stated that.

Senator BALDWIN. You would subscribe to that?

I am asking you the flat, categorical question, would you or would you not subscribe to that?

Mr. WALLACE. I think I am entitled to know the author.

Senator BALDWIN. Is that going to affect your judgment?

Mr. WALLACE. I think I know the author, but I think you ought to furnish it to the audience.

Senator BALDWIN. I am asking you, irrespective of who the author was.

I will make it my statement, would you subscribe to it?

Mr. WALLACE. Will you read it again, sir?

Senator BALDWIN (reading):

"The whole aim and effort of the United States is to attain the objective of peace, to prevent differences between nations developing into armed conflict until the United Nations has gained a maturity in both moral and physical force with which to deal with any international act of aggression. In the meantime, it must be made clear and manifest to the world that any nation which tries to copy the pattern of action which through Hitler brought so much disaster on mankind, must, like Hitler and Germany, face

the determination and will of the United States."

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I will agree to that.

Senator BALDWIN. That statement is a statement that Mr. Forrestal made before this committee as to the reason why he thought we ought to bolster up our forces. I think it is interesting, because you had so much fault to find with Mr. Forrestal. That was the statement as to the policy of the armed forces; that is the statement that comes from the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. WALLACE. Where I disagree is in his likening Russia to Hitler.

Senator BALDWIN. Of course, that is, I am frank to admit, Mr. Wallace, the interpretation an American wants to put on what he has observed happening abroad. I am willing to admit that.

You certainly were not in favor of the appeasement of the Nazis, were you?

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Senator BALDWIN. And I know that you were against the aggressive actions of Hitler, but you claim that the actions of the Russians have not been aggressive.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that they have been no more aggressive than the actions of the United States. I would not attempt to establish an exact balance, but I would say that there has been aggression on both sides.

Senator BALDWIN. Would you say that there is any difference in the manner in which Russia has handled the situation in taking over the satellite nations, any difference in her method to procedure from what Germany used?

Mr. WALLACE. Greatly.

Senator BALDWIN. What is the difference?

Mr. WALLACE. In the first place, what nation has Russia taken over?

Senator BALDWIN. You have your opinion on that, and I have mine. I think Russia has deliberately set out to dominate all of the Balkan states, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Latvian states, too.

Mr. WALLACE. You mean the Baltic states?

Senator BALDWIN. The Baltic states, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

Mr. WALLACE. I just disagree with you, and I would say that Russia had not taken over Yugoslavia, that she has not taken over Bulgaria, and not taken over Rumania, and has not taken over Hungary; that she has not taken over Czechoslovakia, that she has not taken over Poland. I would say, in other words, that the three countries which she has taken over and made a part of the USSR are Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Senator BALDWIN. Of course, if that is a fact, you and I are poles apart on that question—what Russia's action was with reference to these nations.

Would you think that Russia would be willing to submit to an international court the question of whether or not she had deliberately attempted to dominate and succeeded in dominating the political policies of these countries?

Mr. WALLACE. I would think that she would feel at the present time that any international court would be composed of men who would inevitably find against her.

Senator BALDWIN. Then if that is the case, it is impossible to carry out the things that you think should be carried out; and that is, the establishment of a United Nations in which there is real understanding. If Russia has the attitude that anything now done is designed to hurt her, then where are we at as long as Russia has that attitude?

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is very fine to approach the question in this way because you are getting at the very heart of the situation and it is a very fine thing indeed that you are approaching the situation in this way. It illustrates, however, if we really want peace, it illustrates again that we must have a settlement which will make it possible—

an over-all settlement—which will make it possible for the United States and Russia to have confidence in each other.

At the present time Russia has absolutely no confidence in the United Nations because she feels it is completely dominated by the United States. I think that can be changed but I do not think it will be changed by present methods or by the present people in charge of our Government.

Senator BALDWIN. Then your proposal to change it would be to completely disarm ourselves, withdraw all our forces from our erstwhile friends and then trust that somehow or other Russia would understand us? She has not understood anything we have done, pouring out our wealth and withdrawing our armies, gesture after gesture that we have tried to make.

Mr. WALLACE. It is evident, Senator, that you were not here when I was talking to Senator RUSSELL. I think I made it abundantly clear what I thought.

Senator BALDWIN. I wish it was as clear to me as it appears to you but I am sorry, it is not.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not advocated the complete disarming of the United States at any time.

I, in talking with Senator RUSSELL, advocated that we have a very considerable force of full-time men, trained completely in terms of modern science which is the altogether important thing.

Senator BALDWIN. How big do you think that force should be?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator RUSSELL made that question and I finally made the statement that it was impossible for me without consulting real experts, to determine just how big it should be. I made the tentative statement it should be a million for the Army but I would say that I would prefer to withdraw that and say that I do not know exactly how big it should be, but it should be full time and should be in terms of training, in terms of modern scientific training.

Senator BALDWIN. That is what we are trying to accomplish with universal military training, a military force that would not be full time, that would offer a great variety of opportunities for scientific training; that would not militarize the Nation to the effect that we would have continuously a large standing army, which is militarism.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think any military man would think that you are going to get very effective a force out of universal military training.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, they have recommended it and they are the best authority that we have on military matters.

Mr. WALLACE. I know.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wallace, you said you would confer with the military. To be consistent then you would say that we should listen to the military, I mean this committee?

Mr. WALLACE. Naturally at the time I think the military is giving testimony in line with the over-all policy of the administration and in line with the present foreign policy which is based on complete containment of Russia which, as I said to Senator RUSSELL, would take an appropriation very very much larger than you now have and in my opinion an appropriation so large that it is impossible to carry it out.

The CHAIRMAN. If you were in charge of administration then you think that the military would give you advice in line with your views?

Mr. WALLACE. I think that is always essential in a democracy; that a civilian should be in charge of the military.

The CHAIRMAN. Then if that is so, and that is your belief, the military only reflect the policy of the administration then we should not listen to the military?

Mr. WALLACE. No, no; I think you ought to listen to the military to get the technical

facts, but when it comes to over-all, you should use the civilian.

Senator BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BALDWIN.

Senator BALDWIN. You have stated categorically that you are not in favor of universal military training or the draft, and you have also said that we have presently from the armed forces of the last war a tremendous reserve, all that we need?

Mr. WALLACE. To carry us through the next 10 years.

Senator BALDWIN. To carry us through the next 10 years. In other words, whatever military requirement that there might be in the United States, you would be in favor of calling back into the service the veterans of World War II rather than going to a draft of new men or to universal military training?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, you and one other gentleman had attempted to put words in my mouth which I never intended to be there.

Senator BALDWIN. I do not intend to do that; that is an important question, and we do have to decide.

Mr. WALLACE. I know you do not, Senator, because I recognize in you a very earnest search for an outcome in terms of a peaceful world, I am sure.

With regard to the veterans of World War II, I would say that they are there as an ultimate insurance policy if we have to use it, but with any kind of a decent foreign policy we certainly will not have to use it. The point I am trying to make is this: Those men did have the actual experience, they did have the technical training that universal military training just cannot give to you.

Senator BALDWIN. In other words, if we wanted to make a real militaristic gesture threatening Russia, as you seem to think our present suggested program might be, all we would have to do is mobilize those forces and then we would do that?

Mr. WALLACE. You would have made a real gesture in that case.

Senator BALDWIN. But we have not done that. I think the question we have to decide is this: Shall we have universal military training, shall we have the draft, shall we have either or both, or shall we rely for the next 10 years upon calling back into the service to meet an emergency the men who fought the last war? Which way would you resolve that question, yes or no?

Mr. WALLACE. I would not take any one of those three alternatives. I would have the men who were in World War II as a reserve but I would have a foreign policy that would not make it necessary to call them. They are there in case of ultimate necessity, but I would say the chances are 100 to 1 against calling them if we have a decent foreign policy.

Senator BALDWIN. But supposing something goes wrong, we cannot guarantee, no matter how good our foreign policy may be, that some aggressor is not going to attack us. We cannot guarantee that no matter what we do Russia is not going to attack us. We are faced with the proposition of training a reserve and pulling our contribution to an international police force from some trained military men. Where are we to get them?

Mr. WALLACE. You are getting them in sufficient number by voluntary enlistments at the present time and as a matter of fact if you will lower the requirements for entry into the armed services, for enlistments into the armed services to the point where it was during the war, you certainly will get all you need.

Senator BALDWIN. That is the point that is under consideration by the committee but I would like very much to have your opinion as to whether or not we should count upon the present Reserve for the next 10 years; that is, the man that fought the last war, or whether we should attempt to build up a Reserve in some other way by universal military training or the draft?

Mr. WALLACE. It is not quite that straight, either-or proposition, because I always bring in the third proposition which is the decent foreign policy. I say you would not need either the draft or universal military training or calling on these men, but if you should, which God forbid, have an administration after next January 20 that will continue these present fatal policies—

Senator BALDWIN. I do not think we will. I do not think we will have the same administration but there are three different views on that.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not seen too much indication that the Republicans will carry on a policy which is much less fatal than the Democrats.

Senator BALDWIN. I said there were three different positions.

I think that is a fair question. Should we as a Nation count upon the Reserve that we have from the trained men of the last war or should we attempt by selective service or universal military training to build up a trained group of men?

Mr. WALLACE. Let us put this specifically and directly, we do not need universal military training and we do not need the draft.

Senator BALDWIN. That I am sorry to say does not answer my question.

Mr. WALLACE. I guess it is as close as you will get, Senator.

Senator BALDWIN. Apparently it is.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Wallace, do I understand it that you want to leave it that there is no international tribunal today in front of which Russia will willingly go to arbitrate any differences with us?

Mr. WALLACE. I really do not know, but I assume that would be the case. I would be very much surprised if it were not the case.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That was the answer to Senator BALDWIN?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. If that is true, we have to be sufficiently prepared with what our military experts say is enough to be prepared to look after ourselves, have we not?

Mr. WALLACE. You see, in my discussion with Senator RUSSELL, I made the statement repeatedly that it is essential to have this over-all conference with Stalin on the pending points at issue so that we can get those pending points at issue settled in such a definite way that both Russia and the United States would be willing to go into a world federation where there is a world peace force stronger than the army of any nation or group of nations.

I was very much interested in the New York Times of March 4, in Cordell Hull's memoirs where he stated that the Russians were in favor, in the fall of 1944, of a world air force but that the United States was against it. That to me, when I read that in Cordell Hull's memoirs, that to me was a breath of hope that Russia eventually would be willing to enter with the United States into a world federation where the world police force would be stronger than the armed forces of any single nation.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But, until we reach that point, we have to be adequately prepared?

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes, of course; but I make this statement that now is the time to step in and to have that conference.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator GREEN, do you have a question?

Senator GREEN. Yes; I have.

Mr. Wallace, I listened to your statement with a great deal of interest and I hope that I find it in a statement of your political philosophy on which your conclusions were based.

It seems to me that I found the kernel of that philosophy in two short sentences which I would like to read to you:

"The peoples of the world are on the march toward a more abundant life."

A moment afterward you said:

"If we are to compete with communism we had better get on the side of the people."

Now, as I understand it, and I want to be quite sure that I am right in my understanding, when you said "we had better get on the side of the people," you mean on the march toward a more abundant life, do you not?

Mr. WALLACE. That is correct.

Senator GREEN. And then when you say, "Communism is on the march toward a more abundant life," is that true?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I am not—I certainly do not stand for the conclusion that you are about to make.

Senator GREEN. Let us answer one question at a time. You say if we are to compete with communism, we had better get on the side of the people and you say that means on their march toward a more abundant life?

Mr. WALLACE. That is correct.

Senator GREEN. That must necessarily mean that communism is on the side of the people in its march toward a more abundant life, does it not?

Mr. WALLACE. If you want to state my philosophy, Senator, you must include in it also my firm belief in the sacredness of the individual human soul.

Senator GREEN. Let us answer the question first.

Mr. WALLACE. You are asking for what is the kernel of my philosophy?

Senator GREEN. No, I am not. I am asking whether these two sentences taken together do not mean that you say, you speak of communism on the side of the people, on the march toward a more abundant life, is that not true?

Mr. WALLACE. And I ask for us to compete with communism?

Senator GREEN. Is that correct?

Mr. WALLACE. I refuse to be trapped by a syllogism; syllogisms, Senator, rarely give the whole truth.

Senator GREEN. That is not a syllogism.

Mr. WALLACE. That is a syllogism if I know what a syllogism is.

Senator GREEN. You are evidently afraid of it?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I refuse to say that I am for communism, if that is what you mean.

Senator GREEN. That is not what I am asking you to say. I am asking you whether by these words you did not mean, when you say, "If we are to compete with communism, we had better get on the side of the people," and you said that meant on the march toward a more abundant life.

In other words, if you are to put those two sentences together, "If we are to compete with communism, we had better get on the side of the people in its march toward a more abundant life?"

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, that is not what I mean. I do not know what sentences you put together, but I certainly do not mean that.

Senator GREEN. You do not mean what?

Mr. WALLACE. That we are to get on the side of communism in order for the people to have a more abundant life.

Senator GREEN. What do you mean, then, if we are to compete with communism?

Mr. WALLACE. That is exactly what I do say that we must compete with communism in helping the people have a more abundant life.

Senator GREEN. If we compete, then communism must be for a more abundant life; is that not true?

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly the Communists are doing their best to bring a more abundant life to their people.

Senator GREEN. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. I am asking us in our way to contribute to a more abundant life.

Senator GREEN. You say "compete with communism."

Mr. WALLACE. That is exactly what I mean. I want to show that we can do a better job than communism in bringing an abundant life to the people.

Senator GREEN. I understand what you want to do, but in the meantime are you not stating in these words that we are not competing but we should compete with communism in providing a more abundant life? That we should compete with communism to provide a more abundant life for the people?

Is that not what you say?

Mr. WALLACE. No; not in the sense in which you word it, at any rate; it is not true.

What I am saying—and I believe that is at the very heart of our failure in foreign policy—is that we fail to recognize, especially in the backward areas of the world, that the people want more efficient methods so that they can produce more per hour of man labor so that they can have more of the good things of life.

I think we here in the United States have learned better than any people in the world that technology enables people to produce more, whether on the farm or in the factory.

I think we have a tremendous contribution to make and that we should endeavor to make that contribution not so much in money but in terms of know-how all over the world, in terms of helping the people, not to exploit the people with factories that will pay them miserable wages while they use the most up-to-date methods, as was done in Japan before the war—not in those terms, but in terms of helping the people to enjoy a better livelihood.

I think we can do a better job of that than the Communists can if we only address ourselves to the fundamental problem. But at the moment we are not addressing ourselves to the fundamental problem; on the other hand we are cooperating with the former exploiters of the people in these various backward areas of the world, whether China or Greece.

Senator GREEN. I think I understood you perfectly, Mr. Wallace. In the first place, you say we should compete with communism in a march toward a more abundant life; but now as you explain it, we are not doing it but should do it; but the Communists are doing it and we should and must compete with them in that effort and we should not be on their side but get on the side of the people where the Communists already are; that is what the English language means.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I think you are boring in rather superficially into it.

Senator GREEN. It is not superficial. I am trying to get the kernel of your philosophy and I think that your philosophy is this: That communism is doing a better job for the people in providing a more abundant life than American democracy and that is the reason that you do not fear it.

Mr. WALLACE. I say that American democracy is not doing the job for the people in the backward areas of the world which enables American democracy to compete with communism the way she should; that she can do a much better job, and I hope she does do a better job, but I see no hope under the present administration.

Senator GREEN. Do you or do you not say that communism is at present doing a better job in providing an abundant way of life?

Mr. WALLACE. Looking at it strictly from a materialistic point of view, it is necessary to examine each of the countries separately. Senator GREEN. You speak of comparison yourself.

Mr. WALLACE. In north China apparently the Communists are making it possible for the Chinese peasants to do a better job than in the Kuomintang area.

I would like to see us back the ordinary folks in the Kuomintang area instead of the exploiters in the Kuomintang area.

You can go through each of the countries separately and you can draw each of the backward areas of the world separately and you will find that the Communists generally have gone directly to the people and have tried to help them directly and we have gone to the people at the top and I would like to see us get on the side of the people. I think that is the road of safety for the United States.

Senator GREEN. Then it seems to me, if I may conclude, that it is justifiable to draw the inferences that I drew which you perhaps unconsciously at the time expressed: That you believe that communism is doing a better job for the common people than American democracy and that would explain why you do not fear communism because if communism overran this country, the people would be better off?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, you know me better than that. We have known each other a long time and I cannot understand why you would attempt to put words of that sort in my mouth.

Senator GREEN. I am taking words out of your mouth.

Mr. WALLACE. No, Senator; it is incredible.

Senator GREEN. I feel very much shocked.

Mr. WALLACE. I am even more shocked, Senator.

However, ad hominem never gets you anywhere. Let us get to the issues and surely you will accept my statement of belief, however you may put together words in your own way hitherto—you will accept my statement of belief that I want to see our American democracy in the so-called backward areas of the world do a better job than communism is attempting to do in these backward areas of the world for the people.

I want to see them do a better job. I do not think there is any danger whatsoever of communism in the United States, Senator.

Senator GREEN. I am not questioning what you hope and pray for; I am questioning your belief as to what the present situation is and I still do not see that you can deny that you believe that communism at present is doing a better job for the people on their march toward a more abundant life than our American democracy.

Mr. WALLACE. Would you mind showing me the particular sentence where I say that, Senator?

Senator GREEN. On page 3, the first sentence which is only a line long; it is the second line.

Mr. WALLACE. All right. Where is the other part?

Senator GREEN. The next sentence is in the paragraph just below—about half a dozen lines below—the first sentence there which is only a line long.

Mr. WALLACE. What is that one?

Senator GREEN (reading):

"If we are to compete with communism we had better get on the side of the people."

If you read those two together, and my first question, whether they should be read together, and you said "yes," I think the conclusion is inevitable which I have drawn.

Mr. WALLACE. I just deny your conclusion; I do not see it at all. It seems to me incredible that a man could reach such a conclusion.

Senator BALDWIN. If I understood, Mr. Wallace, you suggested that we did need an armed force for our own security of some kind and I think you said in answer to one of the questions that Senator HILL put that you thought an army of about a million well-trained men would be adequate.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I said later on that I felt that it would be essential—that is my first suggestion, I said it would be; I said later on it would be essential to consult tech-

nically with the people in the Army about that.

Senator BALDWIN. I understood you to say a million. Was that a figure that you used?

Mr. WALLACE. That is what I used in the first instance.

Senator BALDWIN. I thought just to keep the record straight you might be interested to know, because you had not heard Secretary Forrestal's request—I am reading from page 831 of the record:

"For the short-term part of the program, we need at once to increase the present actual strength of the Regular Establishment by 349,500 officers and men as follows:

"(a) The Army, by 240,000, from 542,000 to 782,000."

So that on that basis, Mr. Forrestal's own recommendations are nearly a quarter of a million under what you had suggested?

I wanted the record to be straight that we are not being urged to build a military force of tremendous proportion. Secretary Forrestal's figure over-all for the Army was 782,000, and I think you in answer to one of Senator HILL's questions mentioned that.

Mr. WALLACE. That was a figure that I pulled out of the air.

Senator BALDWIN. You would have to depend—you feel that we are justified in depending upon the opinion of experts as to what we need?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I say you ought to go to them for technical information. Then I say the policy ought to be determined by civilians on the basis of what our foreign policy may be.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Wallace, would it be a fair interpretation on my part from your colloquy with Senator GREEN to conclude that you believe one of the greatest superiorities of democracy over communism is that in democracy we do give primary importance to the dignity of the individual and to the freedom of the individual soul—I think was the phrase that you used—whereas in communism, materialism seems to be the primary idol or god of that political philosophy.

Mr. WALLACE. You find that discussed at some length in my book, *Toward World Peace*. That is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I have no questions to ask, but I would like to say that I feel that we have wandered very much from the object of the hearings here today. As I understand the hearings, they are to deal with universal military training and selective service, and I feel that Mr. Wallace has made himself very clear on the both of those. He is opposed to them. Instead he suggests, if the emergency calls for it, calling on the reserve of 15,000,000 veterans of World War II—veterans who probably are, the majority of them, over the age of 25, who are married and with families, rather than the selective service which would bring the young men from 19 into active service in a comparatively short time.

That, I think, is a very clear statement on page 9, paragraph 5, without any qualifications whatsoever, and I want to say that I am entirely opposed to any such suggestion of philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, thank you, Mr. Wallace.

Mr. WALLACE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. There are other witnesses this afternoon.

Dr. Cadbury, we will hear from you next.

Will you come forward, please? You may proceed, Dr. Cadbury. I understand you represent the Society of Friends.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Wallace has a right to have his views known by the people of the country. When a Senator quotes two lines from the statement of General

Bradley, and three lines from a statement of General Eisenhower, now president of Columbia University, and does not quote the man who for many years was considered by the Democratic Party to be a great and wise man, I want to protect the man who for 4 years presided over this body.

Mr. President, I serve notice that I shall make a second speech in connection with my amendment before it is voted on.

I now yield the floor.

COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES IN DISASTER AREAS

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER's speech,

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. CORDON. I desire to introduce a bill.

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, and so forth.

I hope to have an opportunity of making a few remarks on it later in the session. I do not desire to interrupt my colleague from North Dakota for that purpose at this time.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2831) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—
INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED
FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	O'Connor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stennis
Cooper	Lucas	Stewart
Cordon	McCarthy	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Dworschak	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Eaton	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Feazel	Malone	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the pending question, as I understand, is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to add, on page 65 of the bill, in line 4, after the word "compensation", the words "but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. As I see the matter, Mr. President—and I am sure the committee agrees with me—this amendment is not germane to this personnel bill. In the committee we decided to add the utilization of industry section for the reason that in calling men to the colors by means of selective service, we should at the same time guarantee that they will be equipped. We feel that an amendment regulating profit is not germane to this bill. It should be handled as a revenue measure before the Finance Committee. It should be handled by renegotiation, as the matter is presently being handled, because recently we adopted a renegotiation clause in the appropriation bill authorizing the purchase of airplanes.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only do I associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said about this amendment, but in my opinion it renders an otherwise intelligible section of the bill utterly meaningless. It does not say whether the 10 percent shall

apply for 1 day or 1 year or for some other period of time, and it would destroy the meaning of the provision which now is in the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is correct.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, on page 65, in line 4.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a number of amendments are available. I am sure the Senator from Georgia is ready now to offer the amendment which he has lying on the desk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I call up, and ask to have read, the amendment intended to be proposed by me for myself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. (a) Any person who registers as required by the terms of this act, and any person who hereafter voluntarily enlists in the armed forces of the United States, shall be afforded an opportunity to state in writing over his signature whether he was a preference to serve only in a unit all of the enlisted personnel of which are of his own race. Such opportunity shall be afforded at the time of registration in the case of those registering under the requirements of this act, or upon enlistment in the case of those who hereafter enlist in the armed forces of the United States. Any such person who expresses such preference shall thereafter be assigned only to units of a type consistent with his preference. The right to express and the effect of expressing any such preference shall be clearly explained to each person who hereafter registers under this act or enlists in the armed forces of the United States. As used in this section the term "unit" means a group of persons serving in the armed forces who (1) share the same housing, messing, or sanitary facilities, or (2) participate jointly in recreational or social activities. For the purposes of this subsection an individual's race shall be determined in accordance with the more detailed classification as to race used by the Bureau of the Census in connection with the taking and preparation of statistics of the Sixteenth Census of the United States. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the assignment of any individual who belongs to a race comprising less than 1 percent of the population of the United States to units containing enlisted personnel of the most numerous race in the United States, if the Secretary of the armed force concerned has determined that it is impracticable to organize units all of the enlisted personnel of which are of such individual's race.

(b) Any commissioned officer of the armed forces who knowingly and willfully denies to any person his right to express a preference upon enlistment as provided by subsection (a) or assigns any person after enlistment or induction to any unit in violation of the provisions of such subsection shall be guilty of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman and shall be subject to trial and punishment under the appropriate article of war or article for the government of the Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to make it perfectly clear

that there is no real similarity between the proposition I now submit and the amendments proposed yesterday by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The confused impression has been created that one of these proposals was designed to serve as an antidote for the other, and that each is as revolutionary as the other in its effect. This is far from the truth.

The proposals offered by the Senator from North Dakota would have brought about drastic changes in the organization and operation of all of our armed services. His nonsegregation amendment would have completely transformed the tables of organization and the system employed by the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps from the time of their creation down to the present day. His other amendments went further afield and undertook to change the Constitution and laws of sovereign States, as well as long-established customs of life of our people. They could have only caused great confusion. They came from one who is opposed to the enactment of selective-service legislation.

On the contrary, the pending proposal in manner changes the system which has been applied in the armed forces of this country for 150 years. It merely recognizes by law a right of the individual American citizen which had never been questioned by anyone until 4 or 5 years ago. It prevents rather than creates confusion. It comes from those who are strongly supporting the principles of the pending legislation. We have no desire or purpose to hamper or delay its passage. We only seek to make it more effective by preventing threatened changes in long-tried methods which changes are sure to cause chaos and confusion and defeat the basic purposes of this legislation, even if it is enacted, by weakening the effectiveness of our entire national defense establishment.

The purpose and effect of the pending amendment is clear. It is simply worded, and may be applied and administered without any difficulty. It merely proposes to guarantee to any individual citizen brought into the services the right to serve in a military unit composed of members of his own race where such individual makes an affirmative declaration of his desire to do so. It does not deprive any other individual citizen of a single right, real or imaginary. If at the time of registration or induction any young man declares that he prefers to serve with his own kind, this proposal assures him of that privilege. The same identical right is allowed those of any and all races of our people, whether belonging to the majority or whether called a minority. It does not discriminate against any citizen or group of citizens. It does not take away anything from anyone. It cannot harm or injure anyone. It does not deny any individual the right to serve in units composed of mixed races if he so desires and is ordered to do so. It does not change the present policy of assignment used by the Army and Air Corps.

That is all that is involved. It is almost unbelievable that there can be opposition to such a fundamentally fair

and American proposal, particularly since there is no conflict between it and the system which has enabled us to emerge victoriously from every war in which this country has been engaged.

Unfortunately, it appears that this amendment cannot be considered in an atmosphere of calmness such as should characterize the legislative deliberations of the Senate of the United States. I urge Senators to open their minds and accord it a fair hearing on its merits. I realize that this is an election year. I know that we are afflicted with the political hysteria which besets us every 4 years when we elect our public officials from the Presidency on down. I know that perspectives are often blurred by the desire to capture the votes of a highly organized and very vocal minority. I know the truth of the old saw, "The squeaking wheel gets the grease."

It is our duty, however, to protect the rights of the individual citizen and to consider the desires of the unorganized and inarticulate majority of both parties, even though there be no immediate threat to translate those desires into votes. If we would but do that, I am convinced that this amendment would be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

The passage of selective service legislation when we are not engaged in a shooting war is an unprecedented step. We are proposing to interrupt each year the normal lives of nearly a million young Americans of all races. We declare that the dangers of today's troubled world are so grave that we must resort to the compulsions of law in order to obtain enough men for the armed services to secure the defense of our Nation.

I am one of those who believe that the conditions confronting us demand that we take this very drastic step. But, Mr. President, I insist that men who are required by law to forego the opportunities of civilian life for 2 years in order to serve their Nation as soldiers have rights as American citizens which we as their representatives are bound to respect, if we in good conscience represent them. They will be patriotic citizen soldiers of this great Republic, and should be honored as such. They are being drafted into the highest public service, and should not be treated as though they had been found guilty of the commission of a felonious offense. We should be exceedingly careful not to indicate by any word or act that they are to be treated as felons sentenced to the penitentiary, because we find it necessary to call them to the service of their country against their will. We should consider their wishes as fellow citizens of this Republic. It is appropriate to allow them any measure of autonomy or independence which is consistent with military discipline and general efficiency. I submit, Mr. President, it is not asking too much for them to insist that instead of making the conditions of their service intolerable or unpleasant the Congress should exercise great care to see that their surroundings should be as pleasant as possible and that the rights and wishes of every individual called are retained and respected, insofar as it is compatible with the maintenance of an efficient Military Establishment.

That is all this amendment proposes to do.

I submit, Mr. President, that if there is any one fundamental and sacred right inherent in every individual in a free state it is the right of choosing the type of people with whom we will associate in our daily lives. This right is respected everywhere if there is a pretense of democracy. Everyone who truly believes in a democracy must respect and defend this right. Without it the individual is stripped of his essential dignity. The denial of this right is the hallmark of the police state. Even war cannot justify its temporary suspension unless the very existence of the land is endangered.

The vast majority of those who will be taken or forced into the services by this legislation each year will serve as enlisted men. There is no more intimate human relationship known to men than that of enlisted men serving together at the squad level. They eat and sleep together. They use the same sanitary facilities day after day. They are compelled to stay together in the closest association. Except for the members of their own squad or platoon they have no confidants with whom they may discuss their letters from home and with whom they may talk of their plans and hopes for the future when they shall have finished the service required by this law.

These things may sound trivial to Senators sitting in this Chamber. I can assure the Senate that they are not small in the minds and hearts of boys serving as soldiers a long way from home. This amendment merely recognizes that, though soldiers, these men are still citizens of the United States. To deny them this simple right because, forsooth, they are compelled to sacrifice 2 years for their country, is to treat them as automatons or animals whose preferences and happiness are of little concern.

I repeat, Mr. President, this amendment can harm no individual American citizen nor deprive a single one of any right, real or imaginary. It will only make secure a very modest privilege to men who are required to give a great deal that we may safely sit in this Hall enjoying the honors and emoluments of Senators.

Many of those who will serve have enjoyed greater opportunities than some of their fellow citizens and they will be permitted the rank of commissioned officers. Commissioned officers have some privileges enabling them to maintain their right of association. We will have a more democratic, as well as a more efficient service, if we make it possible for enlisted men who wish to take advantage of this provision to have the right to express themselves as to their associates.

I wish that the people of the United States could be permitted to understand and pass upon the principle involved in this amendment. If that could happen I am confident that it would meet with the approval of a majority of every one of the diverse races constituting our citizenship. It would appear that many Senators are of the opinion that their constituency, of whatever race, has no

interest in the recognition of this right of those who express such a preference to serve with their own race and kind. I would not presume to speak for the people of any part of this Nation, other than my own section. I do, however, hazard the prediction that if this proposition is submitted to the young men of every race who will be called under the terms of this bill, a very large majority of each race and of every section will approve of it. I think the majority in its favor in North Dakota would be as substantial as that in the State of Georgia. I believe that the citizens of Maine or of California or of any other State would approve of it. It is plain Americanism. Even those who would prefer to have their sons serve in unsegregated units could scarcely be so narrow as to deny the right of any other young American to assert a preference to serve in a unit composed of members of his own race.

The people of this country recognize the great sacrifice which we are requiring of all of these men. It may seem to be good politics for the moment, in view of the opposition expressed in some quarters, to vote against this amendment. I assert, Mr. President, that if the events which I apprehend do come to pass, there will be ample opportunity in the future for all of us to reflect upon the political wisdom of voting against this amendment. Its fundamental fairness has never been challenged. In the discussion in the committee where it was defeated, as well as in the criticisms voiced by the press, I have seen no one deny the justice of this small measure of freedom to choose the type of people with whom one must associate merely because a man is compelled to make an unusual sacrifice for his country.

I realize that there are those who are determined to destroy any semblance of segregation, either voluntary or by law, not only in the armed services but in every phase and incident of our daily lives. Those people will find this amendment obnoxious. Let them point out where it does violence to the rights of any individual citizen to allow another individual the right to express this choice in his conditions of service.

Having been unable to oppose this proposal on its merits, the opposition has been compelled to resort to two specious arguments against it. One of them is the argument that there is no necessity for the amendment nor any reason to include it in the law. The other undertakes to raise the rather puerile bugaboo of difficulties in its administration.

Because, Mr. President, I am so strong in my belief that selective service or other legislation similar to this is necessary, I have earnestly and prayerfully sought solace in the argument that there was no necessity for placing any safeguard in the law to protect the rights of those who wish to express a choice as to the type of associates they will live with while in the service. My search has been in vain. I have been unable to find any justification for any confidence in the argument that there is no danger of the adoption by Executive order of the same theory contained in amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota. All that I

heart, as well as my knowledge of human nature, convinces me that if we are to show any regard for the preservation of the individual right which this amendment will protect it is most necessary that it be incorporated into the law.

It does not require any great understanding of our form of government or knowledge of the Constitution of the United States to be aware of the powers of the President and of Cabinet members appointed by him over our armed forces. Section 2 of article II of the supreme law, the Constitution, declares, "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States." The President of the United States has no difficulty in ridding his Cabinet of any member who does not respect his wishes. He has almost autocratic powers over those who serve in the armed forces of the United States unless his acts run counter to a law enacted by Congress under the constitutional powers of the Congress. We have not only the right but the duty to make such laws for the administration and direction of the armed service as we deem proper. Section 8 of article I of the Constitution makes it mandatory upon the Congress to "raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a Navy," and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." The President has the power to act where the Congress fails or refuses to exercise its primary responsibility for the proper guidance of those in command of those forces.

In this case we are confronted with the fact known to all Members of the Congress that the President has repeatedly, officially and formally, served notice on the Congress of the views he holds as to this issue. He had advised us of the action he proposes to take if the Congress does not have the courage to express itself on this issue, when we have under consideration a bill of this character. No one but the Congress can be blamed for any consequences of our failure to adopt this amendment. In the absence of legislation by the Congress on this subject there can be no question as to the constitutional power of the President to enforce his announced decision to eliminate segregation in the armed services, whether segregation has been dictated by military considerations or based on the expression of choice of individuals in the future.

The adoption of this proposal will not go as far as I would like, because it would permit unsegregated units where the individuals comprising units have expressed no choice as to service. It will, however, have the effect of enabling those belonging to either the majority or a minority race who wish to do so to serve with their own kind.

Referring to the position of the President, it is so clear and oft repeated that to hold the view that this amendment is not necessary would be to delude one's self. I have here the report of the President's committee on what he chooses to call civil rights. The committee making this report was appointed by the Presi-

dent for specific purposes. Through the entire report runs the same thread of condemning what it calls discrimination in the armed forces, and the report makes it abundantly clear that in the view of the committee any form of segregation amounts to discrimination. The President's committee adopts the comparatively new idea that the word "segregation" and the word "discrimination" are completely synonymous.

The President has endorsed this report without any qualification as to detail. I shall not read all the arguments of the report dealing with this subject, but I do wish to read briefly from its conclusions, wherein it makes its recommendations as to the proper organization of the armed forces. It says:

Legislation and regulations should expressly ban discrimination and segregation in the recruitment, assignment, and training of all personnel in all types of military duty. Mess halls, quarters, recreational facilities, and post exchanges should be non-segregated. The National Guard, Reserve units, and any universal military-training program should all be administered in accordance with these same standards.

That is the background of the President's message to the Congress on February 2, when he officially notified the Congress of the views he had previously expressed when the committee made its report. It was no snap judgment on his part. He had appointed a committee to advise him, the committee had held hearings and submitted its report, he had approved the report in a public statement, and called it officially to the attention of the Congress in these words:

During the recent war and in the years since its close we have made much progress toward equality of opportunity in our armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.

This is the pertinent part:

I have instructed the Secretary of Defense to take steps to have the remaining instances of discrimination in the armed services eliminated as rapidly as possible. The personnel policies and practices of all the services in this regard will be made consistent.

Lest one should attempt to console himself with the idea that the word "discrimination" as here used admits of the "separate but equal" theory, let him take counsel of his reason and consider the fact that the President's committee deals with the words "segregation" and "discrimination" as being synonymous, and the further fact that the Navy, prior to his statement that all the services would be made consistent, had officially abolished any form of segregation in the Navy.

Of course, Mr. President, this is not the most drastic recommendation of this misnamed civil-rights program, a program which, I may say, has caused considerable resentment in some sections of this country.

The report is replete with instances where it is recommended that new rights be created for those who are fortunate enough to belong to a minority race at the expense of rights, long cherished and never challenged, of individuals who belong to the majority race.

I shall not, of course, deal with the other phases of the report. I only observe in passing that about the only thing overlooked in the report of the President's committee in establishing these new rights for the members of minority races was to recommend a commission similar to the FEPC to fine and imprison any banker refusing a loan to a member of a minority race if there be any ground to suspect that the refusal was prompted by reason of the race or creed of the applicant. If any person in this country has a civil right to have another fined or imprisoned for refusing him a job, he should certainly have a similar right of action against a banker where an application for a bank loan rather than an application for a job is involved. I cannot understand how this Commission overlooked recommending the creation of a Fair Bank Loan Commission. I rather suspect that Mr. Wallace will beat the two old parties in espousing this idea.

It is unnecessary to go further into the details of the report. No person who reads it and the President's endorsement thereof, as well as his message to the Congress, could possibly delude himself with the idea that this amendment is mere surplusage and unnecessary, unless he deliberately wishes to do so.

Mr. President, I have here a copy of the New York Times dated Friday, May 28, within the past 2 weeks, which carries a headline on the front page that "President stands on antibias order to armed forces."

I shall read only the first paragraph.

Injection of the segregation issue into the congressional fight over the stopgap selective draft has not caused any change in President Truman's instructions to the Secretary of Defense to eliminate racial discrimination within the armed forces, the Chief Executive told a news conference today.

The remainder of the article deals with the subject at great length, but it is abundantly clear that the President is firm in his determination to carry out the recommendations of what he calls his Civil Rights Committee.

Even if the danger were not so imminent, it is a complete answer to the argument that it is unnecessary to adopt the amendment to answer that the provision cannot hurt anything if it is inserted in the bill.

Not only do the President's oft-repeated views disclose the necessity for the amendment, but, as I have said, the policy of nonsegregation has been put into effect in the Navy. The action of the Navy in abolishing segregation is warmly applauded in this report. It has likewise been applauded by the lobbyists for the National Association for Advancement of Colored People and other organized minority groups.

Up until this time the abolition of segregation in the Navy has been more a matter of an order than an established fact. The Navy has had volunteers in sufficient numbers of the types desired by the recruiting service, and I understand that less than 5 percent of their total personnel are Negroes. In addition to this, all of those who are now in the Navy enlisted of their own free will and accord.

They took their chances with theoretical knowledge of the Navy's policy of enlistment and assignment to duty. This bill, however, will greatly increase the size of the Navy. It will either induce the enlistment or select for service in the Navy a total of 140,000 men a year. Once the policy of selection is applied we may be sure that at least 10 percent of these enlistees or draftees will be nonwhites.

The State I represent in part here has more Negro citizens than any other State of the Union. I would fight for equal treatment for Negroes drafted into the Navy, or any other branch of the service for that matter, just as vigorously as I oppose the compulsory establishment of unsegregated units. I would be the first to insist that where Negroes demonstrate capacity and ability they should be advanced to the grade to which they are entitled. They are of course entitled to the same treatment in clothing, rations, wages, and quarters as those issued or assigned to the white race, and I do not understand it has ever been complained that their quarters are not in every respect equal.

I also in the amendment demand for my Negro constituents the right to claim the privilege of serving in units composed of members of their own race. There is little doubt in my mind that a majority of them will affirmatively request service with their own race. They will find the 2 years they would be required by the proposed law to serve much pleasanter when serving with their own kind, and where they desire it they are entitled to be assigned to units of their own race. In cases where they or members of any other race express no choice the Navy will, of course, assign them to unsegregated units.

There are those who rely on the testimony of General Eisenhower as to the importance of assigning men to units composed of members of their own race and also rely upon statements attributed to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense that no immediate change is contemplated in the policies of the Army and Air Force. General Eisenhower's testimony before the Armed Services Committee on the subject of segregation strongly supports the principle of this amendment. He points out that it is to the advantage of the Negro to have him serve with members of his own race, and his argument on this point is unanswerable. General Eisenhower's testimony clearly proves that the Army is more efficient with separate units for the races, and that such a policy is to the advantage of both.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the portion of General Eisenhower's testimony on this subject bearing on the question I have just discussed.

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

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I ask you one further question? There have been some very extreme statements made before this committee, and I think I have heard most of the evidence concerning the program of segregation in the Army, and in the possibilities of segregation of races or creeds

or colors in this UMT program. You have been the Chief of Staff, a very distinguished general. I think it would be extremely helpful if you would elaborate briefly your views on that problem and what the Army is doing about it at the present time.

General EISENHOWER. It has been the problem, of course, that has been with the Army ever since it has been with the country. We must never forget that in a very definite way the Army is merely one of the mirrors that holds up to our faces the United States of America. It has never been easy to solve because you have certain incontrovertible facts that you must walk right up to.

One of them is that there is race prejudice in this country, and when you put in the same organization and make live together under the most intimate circumstances men of different races, we sometimes have trouble. Therefore, there has been a sort of a compromise made with this problem, right down through the years with the Army. When I first joined the Army there were two regiments of infantry that were Negro, two regiments of cavalry. We began to organize smaller units, and I believe at the present regulations allow us to build down to company strength, the company being the smallest administrative unit. It allows them to live together, mess together, sleep together, and so on.

I personally have always stood since that time for organizing the Negro down to include units no larger than platoons. It does create certain social problems on a post, because you always have men that do not like to mingle freely between the races, and therefore if you have a dance for your soldiers, you have a problem. But I believe those things can be handled. They are not too difficult; particularly since we are going to have large posts, the social problem can be met without difficulty. I personally see no reason why he should not be amalgamated to that extent.

Now, if you are going to go further, here is the problem you run into, Senator. In general, the Negro is less well educated than his brother citizen that is white, and if you make a complete amalgamation, what you are going to have is in every company the Negro is going to be relegated to the minor jobs, and he is never going to get his promotion to such grades as technical sergeant, master sergeant, and so on, because the competition is too tough.

If, on the other hand, he is in smaller units of his own, he can go up to that rate, and I believe he is entitled to the chance to show his own wares.

I do not mean to say that I have any final answer to the problem, and I believe that the human race may finally grow up to the point where it will not be a problem. It will disappear through education, through mutual respect, and so on. But I do believe that if we attempt merely by passing a lot of laws to force someone to like someone else, we are just going to get into trouble.

On the other hand, I do not by any means hold out for this extreme segregation as I said when I first joined the Army 38 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator RUSSELL has a question, General.

Senator RUSSELL. My question will not be the one I first had in mind, due to the question that Senator SALTONSTALL asked.

The question of segregation is one that is always painful for me to discuss, and particularly unpleasant for me to ask questions that I shall now, but due to the decided views I have on this issue, I must ask these questions. More is involved than racial prejudice, it goes directly to such vital factors as the morale, discipline, and health of the troops.

You are familiar, I am sure, with the ratio of crime among Negro troops as compared with white troops in the service, are you not?

General EISENHOWER. Well, certainly on a partial basis, within my own theater, I would say.

Senator RUSSELL. How did the ratio of crime among the Negro troops compare with that of the white troops?

General EISENHOWER. It was higher.

Senator RUSSELL. You are familiar with the reports that indicated the incidence of venereal diseases, were you not?

General EISENHOWER. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. How did those reports compare the colored troops as against the white troops?

General EISENHOWER. It was higher.

Senator RUSSELL. I am sure you are familiar with the figures that among the men examined for the draft, the incidence of venereal diseases, gonorrhea and syphilis, was 252 per thousand among the Negro race, as compared to 17 per thousand with the white race.

General EISENHOWER. I am not familiar with those particular records.

Senator RUSSELL. I would like to later offer those reports for the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say, Mr. President, that I have never heard of any other outstanding officer who has ever had actual experience in commanding large bodies of troops who took a contrary view to that expressed by General Eisenhower. If the amendment is not adopted we have no assurance whatever that the views of these outstanding military leaders will not be brushed aside. I have made some inquiry into the matter, and I cannot find that a single man of experience in military matters was called before the so-called Committee on Civil Rights to support their findings that Congress should by law or the President by Executive order do away with any form of segregation in the armed services.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if the Senator is going to have any comments to make respecting the practice in the British Navy or Army on this matter, if there is any testimony on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. There was no such testimony taken before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, but so far as I know anything about the tables of organization of the various military forces of Canada and Great Britain they have never used absolutely unsegregated units in their armed forces.

Mr. President, as I stated, we do not know that the advice of these military leaders will be respected if we fail to put this common, ordinary horse-sense safeguard provision in the bill, which does not discriminate against any person in the United States.

We must not overlook the power of organized minorities in a Presidential year. I sometimes think, Mr. President, that if this great civilization we call the United States ever falls it will be because the Congress of the United States has not the courage to stand up against the organized minorities whose clamorous voice is always heard here. I do not base that solely upon the racial minorities but

upon other minorities who seek to obtain legislation which is detrimental to the great masses of the people because they are so insistent, because they repeat so often the threats of political reprisal.

We have a very peculiar situation in this country today. The leaders of the two old-line political parties, the Democratic and Republican, seem to be perfectly sure that each of them will receive the Negro vote. Both of them are relying upon the promises of persons who hold themselves out as being leaders of the Negro race who claim they can deliver the Negro vote. The idea that the Negro will vote as a group for either the Democratic or Republican nominee this year, whoever he may be, is utterly fantastic. If Henry A. Wallace stays in the race he will capture a large part of the Negro vote without regard to any promise or any act on the part of the Democrats or Republicans. The few Negro leaders who have heretofore had the ears of the leaders of the two old parties may stand hitched, but members of the rank and file will vote for Wallace as surely as he stays in the race, and there is nothing that either of the old parties can do about it. The same thing would happen if you enacted every suggestion in the report of the President's Commission, and in addition advocated intermarriage of the races and absorption of the Negro by the white race through the process of miscegenation.

However, the bidding for the support of Mr. Wallace's followers has already caused some queer turns. After the convention and when the campaign really gets under way this bidding will go much higher. This will be particularly true in the event there is no slackening on the part of the so-called Southern revolt.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the Senator object to being interrupted for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I prefer not to be interrupted, but I have no objection if the Senator desires to ask a question.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I would not want to interrupt the Senator if he does not desire to be interrupted. I did not know what the Senator's pleasure was in that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have expressed no pleasure.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator then yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask if the Senator has any information as to how the Navy policy is working out as a practical matter? Were the Negro members of the naval forces infiltrated into the general personnel, or were they grouped into groups each to its own color; and, if the Senator has ascertained the fact, how has the plan worked out?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to make some investigation into that subject, and I will say that the Navy policy has caused no confusion until now, because it has been merely a paper policy. I think the Army has been much more honest and straightforward in its approach to the problem than the Navy has been. The Navy has been more hypocritical in its approach, because it has said it has abolished all segregation, and

yet when it comes to enlistment it has been well nigh impossible for any Negro to enlist except as a mess attendant. Of course, all mess attendants eat and sleep together. There has been no issue raised about that. For that reason I undertake to point out that it would be raising a real issue when we draft 140,000 men to fill the requirements of the Navy for each of the next 2 years under this bill.

At the present time a Negro has a greater opportunity to advance in his grades and ratings in the Army, which has in force a policy of segregated units, than in the Navy with its boasted policy of nonsegregation.

The situation would be very acute, because at least 10 percent of each of those groups would be Negroes and the other 90 percent would be white. The issue would arise unless we gave both whites and Negroes the right to declare whether they wished to serve with units composed of members of their own race.

There is another thing which causes me gravely to question the argument that this amendment is not necessary. We are confronted today with something that is without precedent, so far as I am advised. If this bill is passed, the President of the United States will be confronted with a real threat of mass civil disobedience. This threat has been raised. It was raised before the committee by one of the most radical and popular Negro leaders, one A. Phillips Randolph. Randolph was arrested in Cleveland during World War I for obstructing the draft. Since that time he has grown in stature as a Negro leader. He has great influence with his race outside the South, particularly in the cities of the East and West, where large numbers of them are concentrated. He is supported by a Negro official of the State of New York and other Negroes who claim to be leaders. On the eve of an election an administration would be subjected to great pressure if it were compelled, because of the failure to issue an Executive order to abolish segregation in the armed services, to face the threat of mass civil disobedience affecting three or four hundred thousand men and perhaps one million or more votes. It would certainly pose a great temptation to yield, rather than to have to go through with mass prosecutions all over the United States. How could a campaign of mass civil disobedience be carried on against this amendment, based as it is on individual choice? I submit that the adoption of this amendment, permitting the individual himself to choose whether he shall serve with the members of his own race, will eliminate the threat of civil disobedience. It could only be interpreted as a threat of 10 percent against permitting the 90 percent of the population a voluntary choice. The threat would be completely laughed out of existence. There could be no mass disobedience against a law which merely allowed the right to individual American citizens to choose the unit in which they should serve.

I do not know who will be elected President of the United States in November. The Governor of New York was the last nominee of his party, and is one

of the leading contenders this year. One of his appointees, a member of his official family, Grant Reynolds, is among the leaders of the Negro race in New York. He is perhaps more vigorous in his leadership of the civil-disobedience movement than is Phillips Randolph. The Governor of New York is a great proponent of what is commonly called social equality. If nominated he will be subjected to great pressure in the campaign to declare himself on this issue. It is supposed to be very popular among the Negro voters outside the South. A recent edition of the magazine *Newsweek* carries some interesting statements in this connection.

I do not care to risk the effect of the influence that this man Reynolds and his followers in New York might bring to bear upon the present Governor of New York should he be elected President of the United States this fall or during a campaign if he is nominated.

To show how far the threat of a civil-disobedience campaign has gone, *Newsweek* magazine of June 7 carries a 2-page article on the subject. A poll has been conducted on college campuses. Two thousand, two hundred Negro undergraduates have been polled on 26 campuses; 71 percent reported that they favor A. Phillips Randolph's proposal for resisting the draft under present conditions. The poll results were as follows:

Are you inclined to favor the Randolph proposal? Yes, 71 percent; no, 15 percent; not sure, 13 percent.

Seventy-one percent stated that they favored the campaign of mass treason against the laws of the United States unless they had a right to impose their own will upon the Government of the United States, as well as upon 90 percent of the people of the country who happened to be white.

I ask that the remainder of this poll, as well as one paragraph from the article, be printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

TO SERVE OR NOT

Of 2,200 Negro college youth polled on 26 campuses by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1,619, or 71 percent, reported that they favor A. Phillips Randolph's proposal for resisting a draft under present conditions. About 75 percent of those polled were veterans. The poll results were as follows:

Are you inclined to favor the Randolph proposal? Yes, 71 percent; no, 15 percent; not sure, 13 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

If called today to register for a draft into segregated armed forces, what would you do? Register and serve, 24 percent.

Register but not serve if called, 23 percent. Refuse to register, 14 percent.

Not sure, 39 percent.

In case of a real war emergency, would you be willing to serve?

Yes, whenever called, 31 percent.

Yes, but only if segregation is abolished, 51 percent.

No, not at all, 10 percent.

No answer, 8 percent.

These results have to be taken as 2,200 individual opinions since the balloting was done at random and cannot be regarded as taping a scientifically selected sample.

Many Negro leaders avoided open repudiation of Randolph, hoping the threat would be enough to get concessions. Walter White, the careful and cautious secretary of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, said he "did not share Mr. Randolph's faith in the efficacy of a civil-disobedience campaign," but that the only way out would be "the immediate and total abolition of segregation." The NAACP said it would not advise young men to follow Randolph, but White told Newsweek NAACP would give legal aid to those who did.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Congress will yield to this sort of intimidation against reserving the simple right of selection, what can we expect of a man in either political party who is seeking the highest office in the gift of the people? On what issue can we go before the people if we reject this idea which, as I see it, would not only be fair and American, but would absolutely stop the threatened campaign of civil disobedience?

I have already referred to the weakness of the argument that there was any administrative difficulty in applying this choice-of-assignment amendment. I am utterly amazed that it would be advanced by any man who had even a smattering of knowledge of the military history of the United States. It is a purely imaginative difficulty, the falsity of which is disproved by the complete military history of the United States, and the success of the separate unit method of handling our troops in every war in which we have been engaged. Yet we are told that this amendment would cause administrative difficulty.

The War between the States saw the first Negro organizations. They were organized by regiments, and were subjected to real discrimination in that they were not paid as high a rate of pay as that received by the white troops. After the war, by an act of 1866, provision was made for the establishment of two Negro infantry regiments and two Negro cavalry regiments. Up to this time there have always been separate units in which the races of this country could serve their Nation, without any complaint whatever of administrative difficulty. There have always been separate units for the white race and the Negro race. This same condition existed through all of World War I. In World War II, when we mobilized the greatest number of men this country has ever had in the services, there were separate units for the whites and blacks, without any complaint of administrative difficulties.

If there is any one illustration to show the specious falsity of the argument that there is any difficulty in the administration of the amendment it is the record of the handling of the nisei combat teams. The word "nisei" of course means second-generation Japanese. They are native-born citizens of America of Japanese parentage. The entire Japanese-American population of the United States and Hawaii is estimated at 200,194. This is less than fourteen-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population of the United States and Territories as of 1940. The War Department organized these men into combat teams, and they proved to be among the most effective of all

the troops in the American uniform. They all served in the Army. None of them were in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. In view of the record of these great fighting units in World War II, it is absolute folly to claim that any mild amendment such as this, preserving the right of those men who desire it to serve with members of their own race, can cause any administrative difficulties. The nisei combat teams wrote a glorious page in the history of American valor. With a racial pride that is unknown to some other minority groups they were not only satisfied but glad to serve with their own race and kind. Surely if any group ever had a right to complain about segregation it was these men. So far as I am advised there is no record of their entering any complaint that they were being discriminated against. Instead of complaining they showed that there were no better troops in the American Army. They looked at their equipment and saw that it was the equal of that issued to any other American troops. They realized that their mess and quarters were the equal of those of any other American Army organization. They saw other nisei by their sides and felt no inferiority. When brought into contact with the enemy they did not refuse to fight because a white man was not in front of them or another white man by their side. Instead of "fading away in the face of enemy action" they took every objective they were ordered to take; and few if any other outfits of comparable size, whether of the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, whether rangers or paratroopers, received more medals for heroism and achievement in action than did this segregated minority group. I have yet to hear the first soldier who served in Italy who was not loud in his praise of the courage and fighting efficiency of this minority group organization.

It is a great pity that other minority groups do not emulate their example instead of fading in the face of enemy action or refusing to serve at all in defense of their country unless they can dictate all of the terms of their service, even though such terms may be violative of the rights of other American citizens.

Among the most insidious of all the facets of Communist propaganda in this country is the subtle effort to disparage the sense of pride in our Nation which has caused us to grow great. The other day I read an article to the effect that pride in one's State is evidence of a small mind. It is vehemently argued that pride of race is evidence of Hitlerism. It is suggested that there is something unclean about a man who is proud of his country and of its history. Mr. President, if these forces ever succeed in killing the pride that the average American citizen feels in his community, in his State, in his race, and in his Nation, they will have killed patriotism, and these United States will be ready for burial. The competitive spirit between the small towns within the State, generated by community pride, has built great States. The belief that one's State is the greatest of the 48 and the deter-

mination to keep it so has built our great Nation. The faith that our American civilization is the greatest that the world has ever seen, and that our form of government is more desirable than any that mankind has ever enjoyed, has made us the greatest Nation of the earth. This pride of community, State, and Nation, and of race, has enabled the American fighting man to emerge victoriously from every war in which this country has engaged. It has been responsible for our great civilization.

The Continental Army won our independence in the war from 1776 to 1783 through the use of regiments that were assembled in the State of residence of the men in the ranks. Mr. President, some people scornfully refer to this as ancient history. Certainly if the day ever comes when we do not appreciate the sacrifices made by the Continental Army, if we take for granted the heritage we enjoy as the result of those sacrifices, we shall be approaching the end. Anyone who has read the record of that 7 years' struggle for the independence we enjoy today, can not fail to be impressed with the fact that it was the pride of men in their State organizations which finally enabled the untrained Americans to stand before the regiments of British regulars.

According to the concept that pride is a bad thing, I suppose that the historian of the future will be ostracized, and his books will be barred from use in the public schools of the Nation if he mentions the achievements of the Maryland line, the Blue Hen's Chicks from Delaware, Morgan's Virginia Riflemen, or the other fine Continental units which gained our freedom. Their great achievements were symbolic of their pride of State. The war with Mexico was largely fought by volunteer regiments which bore the names of the States from which they were enlisted, and who had a pride in their State which would not permit them to retreat in the face of overwhelming odds. In the tragic fratricidal strife of the '60's, with the exception of a few units of the Regular Army who retained their identity throughout the war, each regiment bore a number and the identity of the State from which its members came. There has never been bloodier fighting or a greater display of heroism than that manifested by the armies on both sides in that struggle. This was in part due to this fact that a regiment from Wisconsin would not yield ground for fear it would cause New Yorkers to laugh at them, while on the other side a soldier from North Carolina would die lest his regimental colors be planted behind those from other States in Pickett's charge at Gettysburg. I never saw a veteran of the War Between the States who did not think that his particular regiment was the best organization in either army, and I have no doubt that this pride of organization was responsible for the accomplishments of both armies, which caused foreign observers from the regular armies of Europe to constantly marvel. Mr. President, we could deal with this subject at great length, of course. There never has been bloodier fighting or greater heroism than

in the great battles in the War Between the States; and the pride of the men in their States, as well as in the Nation, was one of the things that made those men great. That sort of pride of organization is one of the important things upon which we must depend if we are to expect to continue the successes we have enjoyed in the past.

I now come to the argument which is directed at showing the detrimental effect that mandatory intermingling of the races and denial of any voluntary right of segregation in the armed services will have on the health, the morale, and the morals of the armed forces of the United States.

I should have preferred, Mr. President, to limit my argument solely to the high principle that it is our duty to preserve the right of a man to choose to serve in a unit composed of members of his own race. That of itself should be adequate in a free land which claims that its institutions of government are free and that we have a maximum of individual liberty compatible with organized society. But with the great pressure from one minority group to abolish all segregation in the armed services, accompanied as it is by threats of political reprisal and of mass civil disobedience, I fear that the rights of the inarticulate majority will not be very impressive in the minds of some Senators.

Mr. President, it can be demonstrated from statistics relating to the prevalence of communicable diseases and the crime rate of the United States that the adoption of this amendment will be wise. These are unpleasant subjects to discuss. One who has the temerity to deal with them is certain to have his position misrepresented by those who have an axe to grind. There are those who will deliberately misunderstand and distort any statements dealing with these touchy subjects. Facts are not always pleasant. However, I deem it to be a duty to bring these facts to the attention of the American people, and I shall not shrink because it is not a pleasant duty. When General Eisenhower appeared before the Armed Services Committee, I asked him a simple question. I said, "General Eisenhower, how did the ratio of crime and venereal disease compare as between the white and colored units?" He said, "Of course they were higher among the colored groups." Later, to my amazement, I saw that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People the next day charged me with uttering a malicious and false attack on the heroic Negro soldiers of this country, merely because I asked that question of General Eisenhower. They did not attack the General who gave the answer, but they charged me with making a vicious attack merely because I asked the question of General Eisenhower when he appeared as a witness before the committee. I know that the bringing of these statistics to the attention of the Senate will bring in the Negro press lurid charges that I have indicted the entire Negro race. Mr. President, I wish to say in passing that if the Negro press would devote to

attempts to inculcate a sense of racial pride in the Negroes, one-half of the time that it devotes in trying to tell the Negroes that they can force the Congress to pass laws declaring black to be white, white to be black, that press would serve a much more useful purpose to the members of their race.

I know them well. I am proud to claim many of them as my friends. I know many Negroes who are as law-abiding as any white man. Many of them are models of cleanliness. The moral and spiritual life of numbers of Negroes is above reproach.

But, Mr. President, the uncontrovertible fact remains that the Negro race as a whole, the masses of the Negroes of the Nation, have not yet reached the standards which I gladly attest to be held by individuals belonging to the race. Therefore, it is my unpleasant duty to discuss these facts as reflected by Government statistics, in an effort to persuade Senators who do not recognize the rights of the people of both Negro and white races to serve with units of their own choice, that the mandatory intermingling of the races throughout the services will be a terrific blow to the efficiency and fighting power of the armed services which we propose to augment through the draft system provided in this bill.

Mr. President, a failure to adopt this amendment and to allow this right of choice is sure to increase the numbers of men who will be disabled through communicable diseases. It will increase the rate of crime committed by servicemen. I submit in all earnestness that it will be most detrimental to the armed services to insist upon unsegregated units to such an extent that the right of choice is denied. It will have a most adverse effect on the morale of large numbers of the fighting units of the service, as well as upon the morals of the individuals comprising those units. Those who have no interest in the health or welfare of the individuals whom they propose to draft by the passage of this measure should have some concern as to the efficiency and effectiveness of the forces to be augmented and created if they are properly to defend their country.

Statistics can be quoted without number dealing with every phase of this question which will show that the incidence of syphilis, gonorrhea, chancre, and all other venereal diseases is appallingly higher among the members of the Negro race than among the members of the white race. The disparity is great between Negroes and whites in civilian life.

It is likewise great between the Negro units in the Army as compared with the white units, though both races have available identical systems of instruction and of hygiene to prevent venereal diseases. The incidence of tuberculosis among the Negro race as compared with the whites in the United States is almost unbelievable; and of course tuberculosis is a highly communicable disease. The mortality rate from tuberculosis in the age group 15 to 44, according to official documents published by the Public

Health Service of the United States, which are upon my desk at this moment, is five times greater in the Negro race than in the white race. The crime ratio, particularly in the case of crimes of violence, on which statistics have been collected not only by the civilian crime reports issued by the FBI but by the Army of the United States in reporting crimes committed by those in the service, show that it is infinitely higher among the Negro race than among the white race. It is not confined to the South. As a matter of fact, the percentage of crime among the Negroes in the great cities outside the South is a great deal higher than among the southern Negroes.

Mr. President, I have here a publication issued by the United States Public Health Service. Figures and percentages are always tiresome, and I shall not undertake to quote all those appearing in this report. It is unnecessary to do so in order to establish the point I am making. They have to do with the physical examinations given the selectees in World War II. I read this brief paragraph from this report:

In the first 2,000,000 selectees examined, the prevalence rate for syphilis based on serologic testing was 45.3 percent per thousand men tested; the rate for white males was 17.4 per thousand; for nonwhite males 252.3 per thousand.

Every Member of the Senate owes it to himself and to those he represents here to get this fact sheet and read those figures again and again before he votes to permit commingling of the races in the Army. I repeat them:

The rate for white males was 17.4 per thousand; for nonwhite males 252.3 per thousand.

This bill proposes to draft the young men between the ages of 19 and 26. I wish to read the very next line in the report. It deals with the incidence of syphilis found in the age group between 20 and 25 years as disclosed in the physical examinations given under the selective-service law in the report of the Public Health Service. I ask Senators to listen as I read this one very brief statement—

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. GURNEY. I have been talking with the majority leader. The Senator will remember the announcement made at the beginning of today's session, that we intended to go on into the evening. I am trying to answer the majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska, correctly, in an effort to analyze the situation we confront tonight. I told the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Georgia had about finished the presentation of his amendment. Would the Senator tell me if he could be through by 10 o'clock?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I could not guarantee it. I shall not exceed it by more than a very few minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Then could the Senator tell me how many other speeches there will be on the amendment? As

I understand, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are the only ones who are to speak, and the total time to be taken by their remarks on the amendment will probably not exceed 30 minutes. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can speak only for myself. I have no idea of the length of the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The length of my remarks, I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, will be about 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think mine will exceed more than 15 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Arkansas has just told me his remarks would take 5 or 10 minutes at the most.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. I am very hopeful, I may say to the majority leader, that we can conclude consideration of the amendment tonight.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to vote upon the amendment tonight.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to ask if any other Senators wish to speak on the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the majority leader, I also hope we may vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If I have added up the time correctly, and if Senators stay within the time, it would be about 10:45 before we would have an opportunity to vote. I merely want to let the Members of the Senate know that that is about the hour when we shall reach a vote on the amendment. If it meets with the approval of the Senate, I have no objection to remaining in session until a vote on the amendment can be obtained.

Mr. GURNEY. I hope that is agreeable, because I am anxious to finish consideration of the amendment tonight in order to have the slate clean for another amendment in the morning.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida might wish 5 or 10 minutes. I did not want to be precluded, in case I desire to speak, by an understanding to the contrary.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest we proceed, Mr. President, and see how we get along.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, when interrupted I was reading from an official publication of an agency of the Government of the United States which analyzed the results of the examinations which were conducted of selectees in World War II. I was dealing with the age groups of the young men who will be taken from their homes by the pending measure and who will give 2 years in their country's service. I read from the official report, which states referring to the terrible disease of syphilis:

In the age group 20-25 years the prevalence rate among nonwhite males was 19 times greater than among white males.

I hope that Senators from States which have comparatively few Negroes

in their population will pay heed to these figures. When a boy is drafted only has 251 Negroes he will not serve from the State of North Dakota, which solely with North Dakotans or with Negroes from North Dakota. He will serve in an army which is gathered from every section of the United States. I submit that it is unfair to vote to compel a boy from North Dakota or any other State to serve against his will in an unsegregated unit where the chances for his innocently acquiring this dread disease of syphilis is 19 times greater than it would be if he were permitted to express a choice to serve only with members of his own race. It is not only unfair to the individual concerned to deny him this right, but it is almost a crime against the fighting power and the military efficiency of the very expensive military establishment which is provided for by the pending bill, to mix and intermingle all of the men together without regard for race when such action exposes 90 percent of the troops having a very low syphilitic incidence to 10 percent of them having a shockingly high syphilitic incidence.

I shall pass on from this venereal disease fact sheet, through it is replete with figures, after reading one more line which appears thereon. I read it and leave it for Senators to ponder:

Gonorrhea incidence is estimated as approximately five times the syphilis incidence.

I have secured from a study made of the health reports of the War Department a statement showing the percentage of the command admitted to treatment for venereal disease during an average period. These figures reflect the percentages not only in the total Army but the percentages from the units of the armies stationed in Europe.

It may be said with respect to the examinations made of the selectees when they were taken into the Army that the Negroes had not had the same educational opportunities as the whites to protect themselves against venereal disease and to effect a cure. I willingly admit that there is some merit in that connection. However, Mr. President, the figures for the Army in the United States and for the Army in Europe, where both races had identical provisions for sanitation and hygiene and were subjected to the same educational course, show a great disparity. In 1942 the venereal-disease rate among the colored troops in the Army as a whole was 9½ times as great as it was among the white troops.

Among the troops stationed in Europe it was 7.6 times as great. For the years 1943 through and including 1947 the ratio runs from approximately 6 to 9 times as great among the colored troops in the Army, and averages around 5 times as great among the troops in Europe.

I ask, Mr. President, to have the table on venereal incidence in the Army of the United States printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Percent of command admitted to treatment for venereal diseases¹ during the average week, in specified periods—total Army and Europe for total, white, and colored personnel and rates for the Ninety-second Division

Year	Venereal diseases	Total Army	Number of times greater per 1,000 troops	Army in Europe	Number of times greater per 1,000 troops
1942	Total	0.06		0.07	
	White	.04		.05	
	Colored	.38	9.5	.38	7.6
1943	Total	.05		.07	
	White	.03		.06	
	Colored	.27	9.0	.27	4.5
1944	Total	.07		.06	
	White	.05		.04	
	Colored	.29	5.8	.23	5.75
1945	Total	.13		.15	
	White	.09		.13	
	Colored	.55	6.11	.67	4.47
1946	Total	.23		.45	
	White	.14		.34	
	Colored	1.06	7.57	1.63	4.79
1947	Total	.17		.41	
	White	.12		.32	
	Colored	.65	5.42	1.29	4.03

¹ Includes cases acquired while in the service, not previously reported by an Army medical installation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, continuing this unpleasant duty, I also wish to give some figures which I have secured, showing the ratio of crime for 100,000 enlisted men in the Army, broken down into the white and colored races.

This report shows the nature of the offenses committed by general prisoners in confinement at rehabilitation centers, disciplinary barracks, and Federal institutions during the year 1945. They do not deal with such military offenses as desertion, cowardice in the face of the enemy, or absence without leave. They relate only to the crimes designated as civil offenses.

The table shows that the commitment rate of all civil offenses among the white enlisted men in the Army amounted to 78 per hundred thousand. The rate among Negro enlisted men was 229 per hundred thousand. The rate for the crime of murder among the Negro troops was 9 times the rate for the same offense among the white troops. As to the crime of rape the ratio was 13 times as great among the Negro troops per hundred thousand as it was in the case of the white troops. In the crime of assault with intent to rape the rate among the Negro troops was 5 times as great as among the white troops. In the crime of robbery the rate was almost 4 times as great per hundred thousand among the Negro troops as it was in the case of the same crime per hundred thousand among the white troops. In the crime of manslaughter the rate was 6 times as great among the Negro troops per hundred thousand as among the white troops. In the crime of assault the rate was practically 10 times as great among Negro troops as among the same number of white troops. In the crime of sodomy the rate was 2½ times as great per hundred thousand Negro troops as it was per hundred thousand white troops. In the crime of burglary and house-breaking the rate was nearly 4 times as high among the Negro troops as it was among the white troops.

I ask unanimous consent that this table of crimes per hundred thousand of enlisted men in the Army, by races,

for the year 1945, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

Rates per 100,000 enlisted men in the Army, by race (white and colored) and principal offense, of general prisoners in confinement at rehabilitation centers, disciplinary barracks, and Federal institutions during the year 1945

	Commitment rate ¹	
	Per 100,000 white	Per 100,000 Negro
A. w. o. l.	113	118
Desertion	75	105
Other military offenses	41	181
Civil offenses	78	229
Murder	—	9
Rape	—	13
Assault with intent to rape	2	10
Robbery	3	11
Assault with intent to rob	—	—
Manslaughter	2	12
Assault	7	69
Sodomy	2	5
Assault with intent to commit sodomy	—	—
Burglary, housebreaking	3	11
Larceny	29	38
Receiving stolen goods	—	—
Frauds against Government	6	13
Embezzlement	2	2
Forgery	10	8
Other offenses	11	28

¹ Rates based on an estimated enlisted personnel strength as of Dec. 31, 1944 of 6,353,807 white (89.14 percent) and 661,469 Negro (9.28 percent).

A rate of less than 1 person per 100,000 is indicated by "—".

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I also wish to have inserted in the RECORD a brief comment taken from a statistical study of 24,000 military prisoners made by a consultant to the Under Secretary of War in 1946.

Because of the lateness of the hour, I shall not read it, but any person who really wishes to do justice to all parties, even if they happen to be members of the majority race, in the matter of assignment units, should certainly read it in the RECORD.

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

Race: The relative proportion of general prisoners representing minority groups was considerably higher among general prisoners than in the Army as a whole. The distribution by race for soldiers in the Army as a whole was approximately 89 percent white as compared with 9 percent Negro (a ratio of 10 to 1), and 1.5 percent for those of other races. This distribution closely corresponds to that of population figures for the United States. Among the 24,327 general prisoners studied, white prisoners constituted 80.6 percent of all commitments as compared with 17.3 percent Negro (ratio of nearly 5 to 1), and 2.1 percent of other races. In the cases covered by the study the commitment rates were 307 per 100,000 whites, 633 per 100,000 Negroes, 457 per 100,000 of other races, and 341 per 100,000 of all races. With respect to military offenses, it should be pointed out that proportionately

more Negroes than whites come from environmental situations which greatly vary from experiences and relationships in the military environment, and that the Negro soldier will therefore find greater difficulty in making adjustments to the new conditions of the Army experience.

5. Bureau of the Census figures for male felony commitments during 1940 show 70.1 percent white, 29.1 percent Negro, and 0.9 percent other races.

6. Based on Bureau of the Census figures for male felony commitments during 1940 between the ages of 18 and 44, the ratio of white to Negro commitments was nearly 4 to 1, and the ratio of other races to white was about 3 to 1.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, be it said to the credit of the Negro serviceman that the ratio of crime among Negro troops, even though it is exceedingly high as compared with crimes among white troops, is somewhat lower than the ratio of crimes between the races in civil life in cities outside the South.

I have had a table prepared, taken from the Uniform Crime Reports made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of all crimes committed in the year 1947, broken down by races. I ask unanimous consent that the table from the reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Statistics of arrests for the white and Negro races for selected offenses, 1946 and 1947 ¹

Offenses charged	Total white and Negro offenses	White offenses			Negro offenses			Number of times Negro rate is greater than white
		Total	Percent of white population	Rate per 1,000 white population	Total	Percent of Negro population ²	Rate per 1,000 Negro population	
1947 total, all offenses ³	724,476	536,695	0.422	4.22	187,781	1.316	13.16	3.12
Criminal homicide	6,514	3,555	.003	.03	2,959	.021	.21	7.00
Robbery	21,321	12,806	.010	.10	8,515	.060	.60	6.00
Assault	57,622	31,863	.025	.25	25,759	.181	1.81	7.24
Burglary—breaking or entering	37,867	26,415	.021	.21	11,452	.080	.80	3.81
Larceny	63,707	42,812	.034	.34	20,895	.146	1.46	4.29
Arson	1,023	782	.001	.01	241	.002	.02	2.00
Rape	9,648	6,731	.005	.05	2,917	.020	.20	4.00
Prostitution and commercialized vice	9,568	6,108	.005	.05	3,460	.024	.24	4.80
Disorderly conduct	50,244	36,015	.028	.28	14,229	.100	1.00	3.57
Drunkenness	170,869	143,350	.113	1.13	27,519	.193	1.93	1.71
Vagrancy	42,752	32,534	.026	.26	10,218	.072	.72	2.77
Gambling	15,809	8,087	.006	.06	7,722	.054	.54	9.00
1946 total, all offenses ¹	637,383	478,211	.382	3.82	159,172	1.140	11.40	2.98
Criminal homicide	6,430	3,559	.003	.03	2,871	.021	.21	7.00
Robbery	18,821	11,503	.009	.09	7,318	.052	.52	5.78
Assault	50,835	29,173	.023	.23	21,662	.155	1.55	6.74
Burglary—breaking or entering	34,732	24,936	.020	.20	9,796	.070	.70	3.50
Larceny	56,293	38,431	.031	.31	17,862	.128	1.28	4.13
Arson	696	533	.0004	.004	163	.001	.01	2.50
Rape	8,200	5,887	.005	.05	2,313	.017	.17	3.40
Prostitution and commercialized vice	10,120	6,401	.005	.05	3,719	.027	.27	5.40
Disorderly conduct	43,854	32,118	.026	.26	11,736	.084	.84	3.23
Drunkenness	147,596	126,147	.101	1.01	21,449	.154	1.54	1.52
Vagrancy	36,384	28,187	.023	.23	8,197	.059	.59	2.57
Gambling	12,662	6,017	.005	.05	6,645	.048	.48	9.60

¹ Population figures are estimates by the Bureau of the Census, July 1, 1946, and April 1947.

² No estimate has been made of Negro population since 1940 census. Figures used for Negro population are computed on basis of constituting 95 percent of total nonwhite population, as indicated by the 1940 census.

³ Total offenses includes other offenses not shown in the table.

Source: Uniform Crime Reports for the United States and Its Possessions, Annual Bulletin, vol. XVII, No. 2, 1946, p. 124. Same for 1947, vol. XVII, No. 2, p. 122. Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Estimated Population of the United States, by Age, Color, and Sex: 1940 to 1946, Series P-47, No. 3, Apr. 3, 1947. U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 9, Jan. 19, 1948. U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not wish to use all the detailed statistical matter which I have in regard to this issue.

Figures are tiresome things, particularly when they stand by the side of logic and reason and in the way of a position which is determined by a desire to get votes. I do wish to say, however, that my

study of this subject has revealed some amazing facts. I have been for many years, and still am, concerned about the very high crime rate among the members of the Negro race in the South. I knew, for example, that Atlanta, Ga., in my home State, had one of the highest murder rates per capita of any city of the United States. Approximately 34

percent of the population of the city of Atlanta are Negroes. In 1947, the appalling number of 91 murders were committed in the city of Atlanta. Though the Negro population was one-third of the total, they were responsible for practically 80 percent of the crime. However, in my investigation of the record of crimes committed in other cities I found,

to my amazement, that in such cities as Detroit, St. Louis, and Cincinnati the crime rate per capita among the colored citizens of those cities was much higher than the ratio of crime among the Negroes who live in the South. Too many crimes of violence are committed by Negroes in the southern cities, but I am glad to bear testimony to the fact that statistics clearly show that the southern Negro is much more law abiding and less addicted to crime than are the Negroes living outside the South.

I shall not go into all these tables, but I will illustrate my point from the one compiled on the crimes committed in the city of Detroit, in the State of Michigan. I should like to place it in the Record.

It shows, Mr. President, for the year 1947, that although the population of the city of Detroit is 88.6 percent white and only 11.4 percent colored, there were 21 murders committed by whites, who compose 88.6 percent of the population of that city, and 55 were committed by col-

ored persons, who compose 11.4 percent of the population. The crime of murder was 20.4 percent greater among the colored population per thousand in the city of Detroit than among the white population.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this table may be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

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

Detroit

[Population: White, 1,580,800 (88.6 percent); colored, 204,200 (11.4 percent)]

	1946		1947		1946					1947				
	White	Colored	White	Colored	White		Colored		X	White		Colored		X
					Percent	Per 1,000	Percent	Per 1,000		Percent	Per 1,000	Percent	Per 1,000	
Murder.....	22	49	21	55	0.0013	0.0139	0.0240	0.2399	17.26	0.0013	0.0132	0.0269	0.2693	20.40
Manslaughter.....	39	7	22	3	.0024	.0247	.00342	.0342	1.38	.0013	.0139	.0015	.0145	1.05
Larceny.....	435	537	508	646	.0275	.2752	.02630	.26297	9.56	.0321	.3213	.03164	.31635	9.85
Burglary.....	257	235	305	205	.0163	.1626	.0151	1.1508	7.08	.0193	.1929	.0104	1.0635	8.20
Robbery.....	184	245	194	217	.0116	.1164	.01200	1.1998	10.31	.0123	.1227	.01063	1.0626	8.66
Rape.....	47	87	52	81	.0029	.0297	.0426	.4260	14.34	.0033	.0328	.0397	.3966	12.09
Aggravated assault.....	172	352	186	385	.0108	.1088	.01724	1.7238	15.84	.0118	.1176	.01885	1.8854	16.03
Auto theft.....	101	43	122	55	.0063	.0639	.0211	.2105	3.29	.0077	.0771	.0269	.2693	3.49

Total crimes: 1946—White, 1,257; colored, 1,555; 1947—White, 1,410; colored 1,647.

Rate per thousand: 1946—White, 0.00079; colored, 0.0076; 1947—White, 0.00089; colored, 0.008.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say in passing that the figures on crime as between the races are not available for the cities of New York and Chicago. Due to political pressure put upon the authorities of those cities, in which large numbers of Negroes reside, the police departments of those municipalities refused to release any figures showing the ratio of crime by races. We can secure only general figures for the Nation submitted by the FBI, and by making a study of the general figures in connection with the definite figures that can be secured from cities, it is very apparent that the Negro political leaders in New York and Chicago, who have intimidated the officials of those cities into suppressing the issuance of a break-down of crime figures, had a very sound reason for doing so.

Mr. President, I wish to say in conclusion that I do not think all the American people clearly understand this amendment. It has been said time and again that it was to compel the segregation of the two races in the armed services. It could only be done by voluntary action of American citizens. I heard one of the most distinguished commentators last night, while opposing this amendment, in explaining it say, "It will compel segregation in the armed services. Well," he said, "it practically compels it because it gives the people the right of choice and if they have that right you will have segregated forces."

Mr. President, what is unfair and what is un-American about that? If 90 percent of the people of this Nation who are white wish to express preference as individuals to serve with members of their own kind they should have the right to do so and they are taking away nothing from the 10 percent in this country who are nonwhites. The minority has the same right granted to whites.

Mr. President, I am not ashamed of my race. I am proud I am a white man.

I care nothing for those who will say that feeling evidences a Hitlerian concept, because I know it does not. I would be ashamed to impose upon any other man because of his race. Every American citizen is entitled to fair treatment. I do resent any effort to deprive a member of the white race of a fundamental right that does not injure those of other races.

I would, Mr. President, that all minority groups had the same pride of race the Chinese have. One may go to the humblest peasant on a farm in China, living in utter poverty, and it will be found that he has a great pride of race. He thinks that his culture and his people are superior to those of any white man or of any other race.

Mr. President, I would that I could inspire the members of the Negro race in this Union with the same pride of race that I feel in mine. I would not take away from them their pride of race or any privilege of equality before the law, but I shall not surrender my pride of race on any specious argument that possession of such pride stamps me as being a follower of Adolf Hitler or anyone else.

Mr. President, I am appalled by the thought that pride of race in this country could be so dead that a simple proposition permitting people of my race to assert a voluntary preference to serve with their own kind when they are inducted into the service of the United States against their will, to give 2 years, with small recompense, to their country's colors, could be denied that privilege by a vote of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Florida, but the hour being late, I shall just go along with my remarks. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia and I offered the amendment now pending in the Armed Services Committee, and the amendment was defeated. As I remember, we received only 4 votes, which were made public to the press—the votes of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and myself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has been most cooperative, as have all other Senators, in the debate today, and called his attention to the fact that in 50 minutes we will have been in session 12 hours. We were in session practically 12 hours yesterday. In view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina stated that he would speak for possibly 20 or 25 minutes, and the Senator from Louisiana probably will want 20 or 25 minutes, and the Senator from Arkansas will want some time, I wonder if all the speeches could not be concluded within an hour, and if I might not suggest a unanimous consent agreement for a vote on the amendment tomorrow at 12 o'clock, the Senate to recess tonight to 11 a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there is no objection on my part, but my remarks will be rather brief, and I should prefer to make them before the recess is taken tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not press the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator would prefer to make his remarks tonight.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we may as well go ahead and try to reach a vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Whatever the distinguished Senator suggests is satisfactory to me. I should like to agree with him, but the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself, as the chairman of the committee well knows, proposed this amendment in the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I shall renew the unanimous-consent request at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina, if it will be agreeable at that time.

Mr. MAYBANK. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Florida, I shall not object.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me propose a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote on the Russell-Maybank amendment at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, the Senate to recess tonight until 11 a. m. tomorrow. It seems to me it would not be necessary to divide the time, but agree that a vote be had at 12 o'clock, and that the Senate remain in session tonight at least until the Senator from South Carolina shall conclude his speech.

Mr. MAYBANK. Twenty minutes will be all the time I shall need.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate will remain in session until the Senator concludes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no objection, if the Senator from Georgia does not object.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest that there be added to the request that no substitute for the pending amendment be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to include that no amendment shall be in order unless it is germane.

Mr. GURNEY. That the Senate vote on the Russell-Maybank amendment and any amendment thereto, and that the Senator from South Dakota may be given 3 minutes in order to make a statement before the vote is taken at 12 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me see if I can recapitulate what the request is, with the suggestions which have been made.

I ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken on the Russell-Maybank amendment, which is the pending question, and all amendments thereto, at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, only amendments to be considered which are germane to the subject matter; that the time be divided; that 55 minutes be allotted to the proponents of the amendment, to be controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; and 5 minutes be allotted to the Senator from South Dakota; and that the Senate recess tonight until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the understanding of the Chair that the request includes the taking of a recess tonight at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not include that in the unanimous-consent request, but I give the Senator from South Carolina my word that a recess will not be taken until he shall conclude his remarks tonight.

Mr. MAYBANK. And that no substitute shall be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is included in the suggested unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the Senator say that only 5 minutes would be reserved for opponents of the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and 55 minutes for the proponents, in charge of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I might desire to make some comment in opposition to the amendment, and I should like the reservation of as much as 10 minutes time in case I should desire to speak tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I amend the request then to include in it the proposal that 45 minutes of the time be in charge of the Senator from Georgia and 15 minutes in charge of the Senator from South Dakota, which will take care of the time for the Senator from Florida? Is that satisfactory?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is satisfactory.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I think the distinguished acting majority leader in making the request for unanimous-consent agreement has used the words "submitted" and "substituted." I take it—and I want it to be clearly understood for the RECORD—that he is referring solely to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have 15 minutes tomorrow. Will the Senator change his request so that the vote shall be taken at 12:30 tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will have to appeal again to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. It is understood that the Senate will stay in session tonight until the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has concluded his address. That will leave only two Senators who have asked for time. If the Senator from Mississippi would like time certainly the time he requires can be covered in the 45 minutes time under the control of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. EASTLAND. I doubt whether there will be sufficient time left to me in view of the time which, I understand, will be required by the two Senators who have asked for time to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I will modify my unanimous-consent request once again by extending the time until the hour of 12:30, with 1 hour being allotted to the proponents of the amendment and 30 minutes to the opponents of the amendment. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I modify my unanimous request by asking that 1 hour be allotted to the proponents of the amendment, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Rus-

SELL], and 30 minutes to be allotted to the opponents of the amendment, the time to be controlled by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. The other portion of the unanimous-consent request has previously been stated.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request, as I understand, includes the provision that after I shall have concluded speaking tonight the Senate will recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my purpose to submit another amendment which I shall ask to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska, which includes, as the Chair understands, a determination to vote on the pending amendment at 12:30 o'clock tomorrow, with an hour being given to the proponents and 30 minutes to the opponents.

Mr. WHERRY. The time on behalf of the proponents to be controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the time for the opponents to be controlled by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, June 9, 1948, at the hour of 12:30 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the amendment proposed by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) to Senate bill 2655, the Selective Service Act of 1948, and upon any amendment, if any, that may be proposed to the said amendment: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said amendment shall be received.

Ordered further, That of the intervening time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 12:30 o'clock on said day, 1 hour be allotted to those favoring the amendment, to be controlled by Mr. RUSSELL, and 30 minutes be allotted to those opposed to the amendment, to be controlled by Mr. GURNEY.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President and Members of the Senate. It has been my privilege to serve on the Senate Military Affairs Committee and more recently, the Armed Services Committee. My colleagues on these committees will bear witness to the fact that week in and week out, and session after session, I worked for and supported every measure which was in the interest of national defense. During the critical war years, I devoted most of my time to the work of the Military Affairs and Armed Services Committees and helped secure the necessary legislation to build an Army and Navy capable of crushing the Axis Powers.

During recent months when it became apparent that another totalitarian force was a threat to the peace of the world, I have worked with our Armed Services Committee to strengthen our national defense—to the end that we would not be

again unprepared for any emergency which might confront this Nation.

It grieves me beyond words that the question of segregation has been injected in our national-defense program which should always be above politics.

This is a campaign year and unfortunately, for the good of the country, and for the people of the world, there are some who are so determined to win an election that they will injure the national defense of the Nation in order to curry favor with groups of minority votes in doubtful States.

To protect our armed forces from pressure in high places, and to assure that our national-defense program shall not be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I have offered the so-called Russell-Maybank amendment. My colleague, the Senator from Georgia, has discussed that amendment and it is not necessary for me to repeat the unanswerable presentation he has made.

This matter of segregation—as it exists in the armed services at the present—was admirably revealed in the testimony of General Eisenhower before the Armed Services Committee. This great general declared that nonsegregation would slow the progress and development of colored boys who had been put into mixed units. Their advancement to the grades of sergeant, technical sergeant, and master sergeant, is almost prohibitive in the face of competition from the better-educated, better-trained, and more adaptable white boys of the same organizations.

This is a nation of many races but we must not forget that white people carved it out of the wilderness, white people conceived this Republic, white people fought the War of the Revolution, and in victory they gave to the world the greatest system of free construction of government ever known to mankind.

The decent, self-respecting people of this country, regardless of the section in which they live, are getting more than sick of all this kowtowing to a minority group which holds the balance of power in a few large doubtful States.

Senators, make no mistake about one thing. There is a political awakening taking place in this country. Some may think it is smart politics to placate these pressure minority blocs, but there is a time coming when any President or any Senator or any Representative who attempts to tamper with our national-defense structure, or any other laws, to win political support will be forever repudiated by the right-thinking and fair-minded people of this country.

As mayor of one of the Nation's oldest cities, as Governor of a State which had been one of the original Thirteen Colonies, and as a Senator representing the sovereign people of a sovereign State, no one can point to a single utterance or act of mine as being unfriendly to the Negro race. I have always fought, and will continue to fight, to improve his economic status and to assure him equal justice under the law. But I will resist, and the people of my State will resist, any break-down of our well-established

segregation laws and customs which we know are for the benefit of both races.

We do not underestimate the present political power of these groups which are now demanding that our Army and our Navy abandon the ancient policy of segregation in our armed forces.

We realize that this is election year. The situation is bad, but we are going to oppose with every force at our command this cheap, miserable display of political maneuvering to win support from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and other similar organizations which seek to rule this country through the use of their minority block of votes, which votes as just so many sheep. The clean, self-respecting people of this country are going to see to it that a small block of votes under the absolute control of a few professional lobbyists shall not eliminate this Government to the detriment of the majority of the people.

In all seriousness, I ask the Members of the Senate why there is all this agitation for breaking down a segregation policy which has prevailed in our armed services since the Republic was established? Does any Senator seriously contemplate that the mixing up of the white and Negro races in combat units or having them sleep and eat together on our battleships and in our barracks strengthens our national defense?

The wars of this country have been won by white soldiers and I defy any Member of this body to challenge this statement. The Army and Navy have wisely attempted to utilize the Negro soldiers in the positions which they are capable of filling. Certainly there are some Negro soldiers and some Negro units which have demonstrated a certain degree of effectiveness on the battlefield; but by and large, Negro soldiers have rendered their greatest service as cooks, drivers, maintenance men, mechanics, and such positions, for which they are well qualified.

I believe that Negro soldiers should be educated and entitled to a higher level of service in our armed forces. However, racial pride alone should make them want to train and fight with a unit of their own people, and in distinguishing themselves reflect due credit to their race. They should not be content to hitchhike on the accomplishments of white soldiers.

We must not forget that the Negro race is only a few generations removed from slavery. We cannot expect them to distinguish themselves either on the battlefield or in private life to the extent that we expect the white man to distinguish himself. We must encourage, in every way possible, the Negro's attainment of a higher degree of mental stability, but we are not going to help him or his race by thinking this can be accomplished by forcing him into service along with white boys.

Already the Navy, acting under pressure from higher ups, has issued orders to wipe out the policy of segregation on battleships. This same pressure is now at work to abolish segregation in the Army. Unless this policy is reversed, we

are going to create a fundamental weakness in our fighting forces.

A vast majority of the white soldiers and the white sailors of this country, especially in the South, will refuse to associate with Negroes in their barracks and mess halls; and, more important, no decent, self-respecting Negro would want to be forced into the company of people who do not want him. Our amendment gives these boys, both white and colored, an opportunity to serve in a segregated unit if they so desire.

Segregation in our armed forces is a sound policy and has proved to be the most effective in every war in which we have been engaged. This issue is one which should not be decided on political expediency; and I pray that it will not be.

We feel that those who are responsible for our national defense should be left absolutely free to administer the policies they think contribute most to effective fighting units, and should not be hamstrung by pressure from any source, whether from the President of the United States or the Congress of the United States.

In the amendment which the Senator from Georgia and I have offered, we have not undertaken to tell the Army or the Navy what it shall do about segregation, but we have determined that if the Federal Government is going into our States and draft our young men, then those young men shall at least have a choice of rejecting service in a nonsegregated unit. This amendment will not only benefit the white individual, but it will benefit the colored individual, because we feel that colored boys, especially those in the South, will prefer to serve in units made up of their own people.

In view of the plans for inductees to be sent to camps in the general vicinity of their homes, this amendment carries added weight. Many of the training camps will be located in the South.

If the Army adopts a policy of forcing our white boys to serve in such mongrelized units, it will stir up such racial strife as can never be overcome in a decade. The progress which has been made up until now will all go for naught. I predict that the Army will be faced with a deluge of courts martial such as has never been seen. I visualize a conscript army of bitter malcontents.

Those who are agitating the breaking down of our segregation laws may think they are playing smart politics, but they are destroying years of effort on our part to improve the economic and educational status of the Negro.

Time will not now permit me to tell the Senate what the South has done, and what it is doing, to make the Negro a more useful citizen. Our economic struggle in the South knows no color line. Since the War Between the States we have been up against economic disadvantages imposed upon us, which have weighed heavily upon both the white and colored people of the South. To some degree we are winning our fight for economic parity with other States, and as we do, the economic level of all of our people will rise. When this is accomplished we shall have new and better

educational facilities for all of our people.

Increased economic and educational advantages are what the Negroes in the South need, and that is what the forward-thinking people of the South are seeking to provide. Yet our efforts are set back constantly by misguided campaigns to abrogate our segregation laws and customs. It is easy to see that the Negro of the South is being made the victim of political by-play aimed at winning the Negro vote in doubtful States.

I appeal to my colleagues not to weaken our national defense program by giving encouragement to this scheme to put a compulsory end to segregation in our armed services. By adopting this amendment we shall give assurance to those who are drafted of some selection in the units in which they serve.

Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. If the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina becomes law, what effect will it have on the 50,000 foreign soldiers who are supposed to be taken care of under the Lodge amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that the Lodge amendment was never brought before the committee, and never discussed before the committee. I voted against it, as did the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I voted against it.

Mr. MAYBANK. That amendment was not contemplated when we drafted our amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Lodge amendment has already been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina has not yet been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct; but the amendment was considered and discussed by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Lodge amendment has been accepted by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is to prevent the Army of the United States from accepting those 25,000 soldiers and making them subject to the provisions of the amendment which the Senator has in mind, the one which was offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for himself, and the Senator from South Carolina? What would be done with the 25,000 foreign soldiers?

Mr. MAYBANK. Frankly, the committee did not discuss that amendment in any detail. When we drew our amendment, that amendment was not in the bill. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] tried for some

time to obtain the floor earlier today so that we could present our amendment; but it was not possible to do so. We tried yesterday. The amendment presented by the Senator from Massachusetts earlier in the day followed the drafting of our amendment and its consideration by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am seeking information. Suppose we get in the Army 10,000 Senegalese Negroes; French Negroes.

Mr. MAYBANK. This amendment applies only to those who are drafted. I do not presume that any Poles or Italians will be drafted. They will be volunteers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They will be volunteers.

Mr. MAYBANK. This amendment does not apply to volunteers. Our amendment applies only to the draft or selective service provisions. It does not apply to those affected by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like some assurance as to the sincerity of purpose of those who voted for the Lodge amendment. I should like to know whether or not they really meant it.

Mr. MAYBANK. That amendment applies entirely to a foreign group, not subject to the draft.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course it applies to a foreign group.

Mr. MAYBANK. It would have no effect on our amendment, which applies to those drafted by law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina affects only those who are drafted; but so far as segregation is concerned, it would affect those who volunteer as well as those who are drafted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, those affected by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts are not Americans. They would be segregated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that tomorrow, after the Senate convenes, it will carry out the unanimous-consent order, of course, to vote upon the Russell-Maybank amendment at 12:30.

After that amendment has been disposed of, there will be an amendment by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and an amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. Of course I am not stating the amendments in the order in which they will be considered.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the acting majority leader that I would rather not have him state the order in which the amendments will be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not doing so, of course.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure we can work out that matter during the day.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not mean that the amendments will be brought up in the order in which I am referring to them now. But I wish the Senate to know that in addition to the amendments I have already mentioned, there are also on file amendments by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I am not sure

how long the consideration of those amendments will take.

However, I wish the Members of the Senate to know that it is our intention to conclude the action on all amendments to the bill and on the bill itself tomorrow or tomorrow night, even if we have to run quite late at night, and that may mean later than 10:30 p. m., if necessary. I think Senators have been most cooperative; but by tomorrow night we should get this bill out of the way. So I sincerely trust that all Senators will come prepared tomorrow to have the Senate vote finally on all amendments to the bill and on the bill itself.

RECORD OF RADIO STATION KLZ, OF DENVER, IN COMBATING HEART DISEASE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like at this time to invite the attention of Members of this body and have made a permanent part of the RECORD the work of a particular radio station in Colorado, KLZ, of Denver, for its job in combating the Nation's No. 1 killer, heart disease.

At a time when public information is needed on this subject as never before, KLZ, in discharging its public-service responsibility, sought the aid of the Colorado State Medical Society in providing its listeners an authoritative, interesting, and highly important series of broadcasts entitled "Knave of Hearts," dealing with diseases of the heart.

I am happy to say that on May 2 the plan reached its fruition with the first of these programs. KLZ's manager, Hugh B. Terry, and Dr. John S. Bouslog, highly respected president of the Colorado State Medical Society, worked out a detailed plan to bring knowledge of the heart and its diseases to every listener in the Rocky Mountain area. KLZ's staff prepared dramatic and accurate scripts. A three-man committee of heart specialists, appointed by Dr. Bouslog, checked each program for accuracy. Then, to assure complete public confidence, a doctor appears on every one of these vital Sunday night programs.

To make its contribution to the public all the greater, radio station KLZ not only provided valuable station time, writers, actors, and producers, but also spent considerable sums of money in many forms of paid advertising to call attention to this heart series and to insure its reaching the largest possible audience. Newspaper advertisements, a personalized letter to 1,250 business and civic leaders, transcribed announcements by prominent citizens, such as Colorado's chief executive, Gov. W. Lee Knous, transit and bus cards, outdoor billboards, motion-picture trailers, and many more—all were utilized to make the program more effective.

A luncheon was held for the State's Parent-Teacher Association and educational leaders at which time the complete plan for the series was laid before members of this group. The women who rear our children have now rallied round with their support, since they know all too well, for example, the danger of rheumatic fever, a phase of heart disease that

has become the number one crippler of children.

Dr. Bouslog and his group considered the series so significant that a letter was sent to every doctor in the region enlisting his cooperation. As Dr. Bouslog said in his letter:

This series is undoubtedly the finest production of this kind ever produced in cooperation with a State medical society.

The daily press, the weekly press, and the national industry press of radio itself, have singled out the series as a milestone of public consciousness and social responsibility.

Cognizant of the part a free press and radio must play in placing vital information before our people, I heartily endorse this display of civic awareness on the part of KLZ, Denver.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Dr. Bouslog, President of the Colorado State Medical Society, together with the letter from Mr. Hugh B. Terry, Manager of the KLZ Broadcasting Co., printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

COLORADO STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Denver, Colo., April 26, 1948.

DEAR DOCTOR: As doctors you and I are well aware of the toll taken by diseases of the heart and of the broad public interest in such illnesses. There is a real need for much more public education as well as for medical science to make every effort to reduce the ravages of diseases of the heart.

The Colorado State Medical Society is attempting to do something about better education of the public. Radio station KLZ of Denver in cooperation with our society is beginning a new series of Sunday night programs starting May 2 at 10:15 p. m. It is a dramatic health documentary entitled "Knave of Hearts," a 15-minute program designed for adults and dramatizing in an interesting and intelligent manner the causes of heart diseases and what can be done about them. The first two or three programs will be about rheumatic fever, which lends itself to dramatic treatment. All of the major heart diseases, however, will be covered.

Station KLZ and its entire staff is going "all out" on this series. The station has assigned seven actors, writers, and announcers. We are supplying the information and KLZ is doing the writing, production, and the broadcasting. A special State society committee is checking each script. KLZ has assigned this hour because it follows a popular newscast and also because it was desired to reach adults, not children, since the latter might not understand certain programs, especially those on rheumatic fever.

Knave of Hearts has our official backing. We assure you it merits your interest and support. Urge your patients to listen. Urge mothers and fathers to listen. Do all you can to call attention to this excellent heart series every Sunday evening at 10:15 beginning May 2. It is undoubtedly the finest production of this kind ever produced in cooperation with a State medical society.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. BOUSLOG,
President, Colorado State Medical Society.

KLZ BROADCASTING CO.,
Denver, Colo., April 24, 1948.
The Honorable QUIGG NEWTON,
Mayor of the City of Denver,
Denver, Colo.

MY DEAR MAYOR NEWTON: I'm writing you about "murder."

Not murder in the sense of gangsterism or wanton killing, but the kind of murder that takes place whenever a vicious evil goes unchecked. This evil is heart disease—the Nation's No. 1 killer.

Serious? Take rheumatic fever for example. Forty thousand veterans of World War II are victims of it. Ninety percent of all heart disease in children is traceable to it. It's a disease that causes five times as many deaths as infantile paralysis, polio, scarlet fever, measles, spinal meningitis, diphtheria, and whooping cough combined.

Heart disease is so serious that the Colorado State Medical Society in cooperation with KLZ is presenting Knave of Hearts, a series of locally produced dramatic programs that will point out the major causes of diseases of the heart and how they can be recognized and prevented.

I hope you, your family, and your friends will listen to these vital programs. Tune in KLZ Sunday night, May 2, at 10:15, and every Sunday night thereafter. Your children's future, your own future is tied up with the heart—right where you live.

Very truly yours,

HUGH B. TERRY, Manager.

THE FLOOD IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a newspaper article, a letter, and various telegrams which I have received in regard to the flood in the Northwest. Tomorrow I shall speak at some length on the problem in that section of the country, because these communications make perfectly clear the importance of our taking early action in regard to the catastrophe which has afflicted some 30,000 persons in my section of the United States.

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

[From the New York Times of June 6, 1948]
NATION LACKS A POLICY ON CONTROL OF
FLOODS—TRAGEDY IN THE NORTHWEST SHOWS
NEED FOR NEW APPROACH BY CONGRESS
(By Samuel A. Tower)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Devastating floods in the Columbia River Basin of the Pacific Northwest spurred congressional action this week on flood control.

President Truman asked Congress to provide \$600,000 for emergency flood assistance for the inundated communities of the Northwest. Action was under way in the House to append the sum to a deficiency appropriation measure. There was every assurance that Congress would provide the supplemental funds for the worst flood on the Columbia River in the last 50 years.

At the same time, there was going on this week a series of conferences between Senators and Representatives over conflicting appropriations to be provided the Army engineers for flood-control work in the next fiscal year.

SENATE APPROPRIATION HIGHER

The Senate, over the protests of a Republican bloc that sought a \$200,000,000 reduction, approved roughly \$708,500,000, or about \$102,000,000 more than was voted by the House. Even the Senate sum, however, was \$29,000,000 less than the President in his budget had recommended as a rock-bottom figure.

While Congress was considering legislation, men in the Columbia River Basin were straining against new rains and floods, reinforcing levees and fills to combat the still rising river and the threat of still greater inundations.

Not all, but much of the funds carried in the War Department's civil-functions appro-

priation bill was for flood control. One or more projects, big or little, were listed for almost all of the 48 States, though the major target of flood defense was in the Mississippi Valley.

SECTIONAL APPROACH

While many of the appropriations carried forward long-range bulwarks against the devastation of floods, in a program of years—and there is a broad recognition on Capitol Hill that flood-control projects are essential to the national welfare—Congress has never been disposed to view the problem from overall policy and has consistently displayed a tendency to regard it with a parochial and sectional outlook.

In giving emphasis to the Mississippi River Basin, Congress followed President Truman's plea of a year ago. Its outlays, however, have been below the Presidential conception of a vast long-range program to cope with the tragic, recurrent blows to the national economy, a problem of prime importance in our national life, according to the Chief Executive.

On the other hand, a number of members have maintained that Congress has at no time before displayed such generosity with funds for flood control, with construction allocations marked by a huge increase over prewar levels.

Over and above flood control, however, Mr. Truman has urged on Congress consideration of such projects in terms of conservation of natural resources, branding as false economy feeble or inadequate measures while precious assets waste away.

The President hammered away at his belief in the desirability of regional authorities, similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority, which could combine with defense against floods such things as irrigation, hydroelectric power development and other water utilization projects that could build up and coordinate the resources of an area.

The TVA has demonstrated conclusively on a number of occasions that it could control floods and simultaneously produce beneficial power. Envisioned by the President was a Missouri Valley Authority or a Columbia Valley Authority. Only by such steps, it is argued, can a coordinated attack be made against the erosion and recurring devastation and death that come year after year.

In Congress, however, the concept of an MVA or other authorities has been dead as a dodo. The opposition has many reasons, including economy, ineffectiveness, bureaucracy, and regimentation by the Government. Furthermore, the present Congress has shown a disposition to chop away at the Tennessee Valley Authority.

OREGON STATE COUNCIL,
AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Portland, Ore., June 2, 1948.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Portland Housing Authority this morning began consideration of various sites for 5,000 minimal family units (trailers, etc.) for immediate stop-gap relief of the victims of the Vanport disaster. We think this figure may be too low. There are about 19,000 homeless from Vanport alone and several thousand from adjacent areas. The total of homeless for this section of the Columbia Valley is reputed to be 65,000.

It was brought out during the meeting that the Authority has not yet begun to consider any permanent housing program, but may set up a committee next week to do so. Obviously there is danger, in this approach, that possible permanent sites may be blocked out by temporary construction.

When questioned as to their thinking on the subject of permanent housing relief, members of the Authority emitted some vague remarks about the possibility that

some of the victims might go home, and this may modify the need for a permanent program.

Regardless of the Portland Housing Authority's views of the matter, the residents of Vanport, the majority of whom are veterans of the last war, are citizens and constituents of this district and they are entitled to be treated as such. It is our feeling that the views of local real-estate interests are shared to a very great extent by the Portland Housing Authority, and this identity of viewpoint may result in policies reflecting great discredit upon the people of Portland and Oregon.

We ask therefore that you give close attention to this situation in the future. A number of organizations are setting up coordinating committees to maintain pressure on the Housing Authority, and AVC is working closely with the City Club, the League of Women Voters, the Urban League, and others toward that end. We will try to keep you supplied with accurate and reliable information as the situation develops.

Any help you can give us in securing a square deal for the veterans and other residents of Vanport will be greatly appreciated not only by us but by the vast majority of the people of the State.

Sincerely,

KENNETH KRAEMER,
Chairman, Portland Area Council,
American Veterans Committee.

PORTLAND, OREG., June 5, 1948.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

The League of Women Voters tonight called together a group of about 100 Portland citizens representing over 30 civic and professional groups whose members are determined to help find a decent and intelligent solution to the long-standing housing shortage now rendered disastrous by the Vanport tragedy. This group is on record against permanent reliance on temporary housing. After 4 years we want no more. The westward migration is permanent therefore the problem is permanent therefore we must have a permanent solution. We believe temporary stop-gap relief program is proceeding well as could be expected. Our major concern is with prompt establishment of permanent, low-cost housing designed for low-income groups available in 6 to 8 months and with buildings designed to last at least 25 years. No other approach can solve problem. Population experts predict problem will grow worse not better in next several years. The refugees are not going home. They are here to stay. We want to know whether legislation for permanent, low-cost housing is being prepared. If not we want you to prepare such legislation at once. Program should stress multiple rental units of good but inexpensive construction and lowest possible rents. If subsidy necessary it should go to tenant not to contractor or speculator. If such legislation or any similar legislation has been prepared we want a copy immediately by wire. If such legislation is prepared in future we want to be informed on all technical details. Further, we want to be kept continually informed of all developments relating to a permanent, low-cost housing policy or lack of such policy in this area. Toward this end we ask that you give this matter your closest attention until such time as a definite policy shall have been adopted and executed. Please forward all current information at once by wire.

HOWARD MORGAN,
Chairman, Special Housing Committee
of Portland Civic Groups.

PORTLAND, OREG., June 7, 1948.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Portland Federation of Women's Organizations urge immediate appropriation of

\$50,000,000 to meet emergency need for more permanent type housing in Multnomah County.

MRS. DOROTHY SANFORD WILSON,
President.

PORTLAND, OREG., June 4, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Supplementing our request for immediate stopgap housing it is recommended that Congress appropriate \$50,000,000 for permanent housing for Portland flood disaster victims. Recommend this be made available to Public Housing Administration be disbursed to local bodies in loans and grants as may be necessary to enable flood victims to purchase or rent dwellings within their financial abilities. Also recommend appropriation of \$5,000,000 to rehabilitate and reimburse flood victims for financial losses.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PORTLAND,
OREG.,
HERBERT J. DAHLKE, Chairman.

PORTLAND, OREG., June 4, 1948.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have contacted Field of FWA. He is leaving Portland Sunday and will contact you immediately upon return to Washington either Sunday night or first thing Monday morning. He will appear before Oregon delegation sometime Monday morning and return with Fleming to Portland Tuesday. We are all very much impressed with his findings and I feel sure that he has all the answers to the information you requested such as the number of dwellings needed, the damage etc., and more especially the question as to what legislation is required. I am in entire agreement with Field that the legislative program must be wrapped up in one bill. He will discuss this with you in detail. Tom Humphrey also contacted Field and he has I believe a complete picture of what is needed and I am sure that you will not go wrong in following his recommendations in which we all concur. Should you need additional information after talking with Field Monday wire or phone me and I will secure it for you.

PORTLAND LABOR MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE,
LEE STOLL, Chairman.

PORTLAND, OREG., June 4, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Sixty-five thousand persons estimated displaced in lower Columbia River flood area. Five thousand three hundred families involving approximately 18,500 people displaced in Vanport housing project flood. Sunday night, May 30, all Vanport evacuees mass sheltered in churches, schools, and community buildings. Many families taken into private homes. These people can exist in mass shelters and live with strangers for only a few days. Federal, State, and local authorities all agreed on three phases of housing flood victims. One. Emergency mass shelters. Two. Temporary emergency stopgap housing for from 3 to 7 months until permanent housing can be supplied. Three. Permanent long-range housing program. Emergency mass shelter problem no longer exists. Immediate problem is temporary emergency stopgap housing. Of 5,300 displaced Vanport families, 45 have been housed at University Homes housing project; 350 at Guilds Lake housing project, and 90 more in Guilds Lake when waters recede sufficiently to open sewers. It is estimated 700 more families can be absorbed in present private housing facilities in Portland or will leave the com-

munity temporarily. From housing realty board and city's experience only few families will leave community permanently. This leaves balance of 3,800 temporary emergency stopgap housing to be provided immediately. River estimated to require 30 days or more to recede sufficiently to allow persons to re-enter their flooded houses still standing in other areas and another 30 to 60 days before they have sufficiently dried out to allow repairs and redecorating to make habitables. Many of these families will seek stopgap housing in Portland. Representative cross-section committee has determined 5,000 temporary emergency stopgap houses necessary, of which 1,200 have been or will be accounted for in other projects or private housing. Of 3,800 additional stopgap houses needed only have available 440 trailers in varying conditions of disrepair, belonging to PHA, FWA, or WAA. Portland housing authority has taken over 10 Swan Island barracks buildings suitable for hotel-type accommodation of 320 to 400 families. Will begin placing families from mass shelters in Swan Island June 5. When water recedes sufficiently that Portland Airport no longer endangered. Fifty to eighty two-story barracks buildings available for conversion into accommodations for 200 to 320 families as stopgap housing. When such stopgap housing is available Swan Island will be used as replacement center from mass shelters to stopgap housing. Have requested trailers be shipped immediately. Twelve quonset huts to accommodate two families each are on way. Federal, State, and local authorities agree trailers most satisfactory for stopgap housing because more could be realized on resale or could be moved to other locations where temporary or emergency housing may become necessary. PHA has requested Nation-wide survey of trailers available together with cost. Sufficient sites on land owned by Federal Government, city, county, and school districts in and on outskirts of Portland and in Vancouver, Wash., with sewers, water, and electricity immediately available to set up trailers. Must have money to purchase and install stop-gap housing and provide toilets, wash rooms, and laundry rooms. Ten million dollars should be made available through appropriations or net revenues from federally operated housing projects throughout Nation to public housing administration region one to provide temporary emergency stopgap housing. Fifty million dollars should be made immediately available for permanent housing for Portland flood disaster victims. Highest water this area has been Colon, Columbia, 30.2 feet. Willamette, 29.95 feet. Water has receded slightly. New freshet with higher flood crest now beginning. Predicted States: Willamette as follows: June 5, 29.1 feet, June 6, 29.2 feet, June 7, 30 feet, June 8, 30.5 feet. Columbia June 5, 29.4 feet; June 6, 29.5 feet; June 7, 30.3 feet; June 8, 30.8 feet. Dike situation in Columbia critical. Every effort being made to prevent additional breaks.

LESTER W. HUMPHREYS,
Attorney for Housing Authority
of Portland, Oreg.

PORTLAND, OREG., June 5, 1948.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Additional facts. Cost repairing Government trailers \$200 to \$500 each; cost new trailers \$2,000 to \$2,500 each. Cost installation water, sewerage, bath, and laundry facilities for trailers, \$200 per trailer. Cost building temporary houses \$4,000 to \$4,500 each; temporary house cost more; salvage not so great in proportion to salvage for trailers. Survey PHA shows 5,000 to 7,000 trailers available on west coast for immediate purchase; trailers can be made ready for occupancy immediately, houses take 2 to 3 months to erect. No difficulty in obtaining land for trailers. Complications obtaining land for houses.

Greater difficulty in getting temporary houses removed which may if left create slum, shack, or substandard housing later.

LESTER W. HUMPHREYS,
Attorney, Housing Authority of Oregon.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. CORDON (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BALL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REED, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THYE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. YOUNG) introduced Senate bill 2831, to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears at the end of Mr. LANGER's speech.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2832. A bill to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2833. A bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to increase the security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE— INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. REVERCOMB) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAYBANK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2655, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1558) thereon.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of various executive matters, including the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

William L. Alison, to be postmaster at Minter, Ala.; and

Lloyd C. Olive, to be postmaster at Bartow, Fla.

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

Herbert A. Bergson, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

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

Tracy S. Voorhees, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army; and

Lt. Gen. Lewis Hyde Brereton, and sundry other officers for appointment in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, as in executive session.

MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, to be associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Lynch, of Ohio, to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Austin J. Mahoney to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are various nominations of the military which we should like to have considered and confirmed tonight, and I shall ask the Senator from South Dakota to present them.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there are numerous nominations in the armed forces. Approximately three-quarters of them are in the Navy and possibly one-

fourth of them are in the Army or the Air Force. These are largely junior nominations, although small numbers of them are nominations to the rank of lieutenant colonel or possibly the rank of colonel. All the nominations are routine, in accordance with the promotion bill.

I am informed by the executive clerk that it would cost approximately \$450 to have this large number of nominations and promotions printed on the Executive Calendar, and would cost approximately \$1,300 to reprint the 26 pages in the RECORD.

Therefore, I have the authority of the committee to ask that the nominations be presented as approved unanimously by the committee, and to ask for their immediate consideration and confirmation, without having them placed on the calendar and lie over one day. I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in this case I shall not object to the immediate consideration of the nominations, in view of the nature of the nominations and the fact that they are for the military establishment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as is our custom, we do not ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of nominations of general officers.

Therefore, I ask that the promotions and the nominations of general officers listed in Executive Report No. 314 and also the nomination of Tracy S. Voorhees, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, as listed in Executive Report No. 312, be offered for the calendar and appear on the Executive Calendar tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the request, the nominations of general officers and the nomination of the Assistant Secretary of the Army will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Is there objection to the request for present consideration of the nominations of officers other than those just mentioned? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate is now in legislative session, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the Senate is in legislative session.

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of June 1, 1948):

MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Andrew McCaughrin Hood to be an associate judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Noble J. Johnson to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Skelly Wright to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Thomas J. Lynch to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Austin J. Mahoney to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Col. James Lendsey McKinnon et al., to be colonels in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, were confirmed today, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, June 3, 1948, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 7042 with the name of Col. James Lendsey McKinnon, and ending on page 7043 with the name of Brig. Gen. Paul Frailey Yount.

The nominations of Col. Leon Jacob Livingston et al., to be lieutenant colonels in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, were confirmed today, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, June 3, 1948, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 7043 with the name of Col. Leon Jacob Livingston, and ending on page 7060, with the name of Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John James Wood.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE AND CORPS SPECIFIED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 AND TITLE II OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 365, 80TH CONG.)

To be lieutenant colonel

Howard W. K. Zellhoefer, MC, O233474.

To be majors

Charles T. Brown, MC, O301813.
Paul V. Davis, MC, O1685365.
Horace W. Doty, Jr., MC, O212407.
William W. Franklin, DC, O272330.
Vance H. Marchbanks, Jr., MC, O379380.
Harry Spitz, MC, O209984.
James C. Vanneter, MC, O247042.

To be captains

Jesse F. Brown, MC, O1747307.
Roy E. Clausen, Jr., MC, O1786358.
Oscar K. Diamond, MC, O402602.
George J. Hayes, MC, O1725182.
John J. Kavanagh, MC, O542867.
Julien C. Kennedy, MC, O392610.
James W. Lassiter, MC, O469672.
Charles S. Lueth, MC, O1725172.
Richard L. Martin, MC, O1747313.
Melvin T. Pennell, MC, O414939.
Earl S. Smith, DC, O1775014.
William C. Strong, DC, O1746019.
Henry Thompson, Jr., MC, O539345.
Norman A. Twigger, MC, O1725493.

To be first lieutenants

Charles F. Althaus, MC, O936899.
Francis E. Barry, MC, O1705683.
John R. Black, MC, O1786936.
Ralph W. Clements, MC, O1718624.
Millard E. DeYoung, DC, O1756583.
Charles C. Dugan, MC, O490999.
Cloyce L. Duncan, MC, O935981.
William F. Enos, Jr., MC, O1705088.
James D. Green, MC, O1756385.
Harry M. Henderson, Jr., MC, O1776460.
Frank F. Marsh, MC, O1714764.
Marion E. McDowell, MC, O1765012.
William A. Moore, MC, O1786509.
Thomas M. O'Grady, MC, O1717760.
Edmond Scavone, MC, O1725570.
Martin J. Schumacher, MC, O1755987.
David G. Simons, MC, O1726132.
Harry F. Sproat, MC, O935706.
Richard J. Sullivan, DC, O1746777.
Clarence G. Sutherland, MC, O1735210.
George C. Walter, MC, O1786575.
Gordon T. Wannamaker, MC, O1736519.
William H. Westbrook, MC, O1776236.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Regular Army

Lonnie E. Harrington, Wilmer C. Marvin Jr.
Walter N. Higgins, Graham A. Penniman, Jr.
John W. Hodnett, Jr., Lynn L. Pesson
John C. Littlejohn, Walter Redd
Albert L. Loth, Jr., Robert P. Reder
James W. Mann, Jack R. Sadler
Robert W. Martin, John R. Tilden

IN THE AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Regular Air Force

Stanley W. Ahrends, Thomas J. Mathews
James M. Burdette, Jr., Robert F. Saydah
George W. Mathews, Ofus L. Slayton, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following five groups of appointments in the Navy, which were received by the Senate on Thursday, June 3, 1948, and which were confirmed today, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, June 3, 1948, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on the pages indicated:

The nominations of Aaron G. Alexander et al., beginning on page 7060 with the name of Aaron G. Alexander;

The nominations of Samuel J. Abel et al., beginning on page 7061;

The nominations of George W. Absher, Jr., et al., beginning on page 7064;

The nominations of Kenneth Adams et al., beginning on page 7066; and

The nominations of Raymond B. Corob et al., beginning on page 7067.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Stuart M. Cohen, John B. Garrett, Jr.
Morris N. Jenkins, John F. Merritt
Donald A. McCartin, Edward E. Smith
Frederic L. McGiffin, Roy M. DuCharm
Frank G. Peterson, Lyle H. Worster

The following-named permanent warrant officers, now serving in temporary commis-

sioned ranks, to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenants:

Reuben C. Collins
Charles B. Hirsch
Richard S. Hooker

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Austin R. Brunelli, Edward H. Forney
Richard C. Mangrum, Samuel G. Taxis
Wayne H. Adams, Harry G. Fortune
John H. Cook, Jr., Walter T. Short

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Wade M. Jackson, William M. Gilliam
Frank J. Ervin, Hector R. Migneault

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Harry A. Waldorf
Nicholas A. Sisak
John W. Stevens II

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Frank R. Wilkinson, James C. Short Jr.
Howard M. Lee
Irving B. Hayes, Jules M. Rouse
Leslie A. Gilson, Jr., Fritz Stampfli
Paul M. Smith, George J. Brookes, Jr.
Whitman S. Bartley, Robert E. Johnson
Bruce E. Keith, Gordon L. Allen
Robert S. Anderson

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Wallace D. Blatt, Louis R. Daze
Carl E. Schmidt, John Finn, Jr.
Baxter R. Little, Donald S. Hopkins
Orlan R. Lodge, John R. Hyneman
George J. Edelmann, Jr., John C. Shoden
Richard B. Smith

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Donald E. Holben, Jack H. Butler
James E. Condra, Robert D. Winn
James M. Hayes, Donald E. Morin
Patrick J. Hagarty

The following-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Roy L. Parker

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Father, unto this waiting assembly do Thou manifest to each Member and officer such knowledge and wisdom that will guide the present-day life of our country. If any be conscious of undue burden or care which cannot be well endured, O reveal unto him Thy guiding presence. Forgive every empty resolution and wasted opportunity and keep us mindful of our own omissions that we may be patient with the follies of others.

We pray for those conditions out of which come spiritual discipline and understanding that is beyond the analysis of man. Bless our whole land, that our homes may become nurseries of virtue and affection in which we find strength