that if we are to keep faith with the duties of representation as set forth in the Constitution, we, the Congress, can do no less than bring to bear reasonable and fair regulations upon our economy in such a period of crisis.

The question which faces us on this side of the aisle as we adjourn for the week end is, How far are we willing to go in recognizing the fact—and I say that it is the fact—that the voluntary system, without any regulation by Government during the past 12 months has resulted in a type of exploitation and profiteering on the part of some segments of our economy which our Government must halt by fair and reasonable legislation? I have no doubt that my party will do so next January. If it is possible in this short period of time to prepare the data so that we can act intelligently on the subject before adjournment, I think we should do so.

In conclusion, let me say that I believe that next week ought to bring forth a decision as to whether or not we are to recognize that the disunity of the Democratic Party is so great that we cannot succeed in passing a desirable legislative program at this session of Congress, and go home and take this issue to the American people in the election; or whether we are to decide to make an attempt to pass the minimum legislative program which can be passed in this special session of Congress, in the face of Democratic opposition, which will at least check, to the extent we can check by law, the threatening, rising, spiraling inflation which I think will end in an economic "bust" unless the Government does something about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

THE STOPPING OF INFLATION—RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am about to ask that the Senate take a recess until Monday noon. Before doing so, I should like to say, in response to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that at that time the pending business will be the question which has just been stated by the distinguished occupant of the chair, the President pro tempore of the Senate. We shall proceed to consider that motion until we can either agree to it or terminate the discussion in some other manner.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon has made an eloquent plea for action. I assure him and other Members of the Senate, and also the American people, that so far as I am concerned, I subscribe once again to the statement issued by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the policy committee, in behalf of the leadership on this side, that the Congress is ready and willing at this session to consider any legislation having to do with stopping inflation which can be processed through committees and brought to the floor for debate. I think all of us agree that that is the main problem, and that if anything can be done it will be done.

Certainly we have before us a bill which is being offered by the President of the United States. It was introduced by the candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket, and the bill is now being considered before the House committee. After the hearings are concluded in the House committee or in the Senate committee, if the proposed legislation is brought to the floor, it will be debated.

However, as we close this day's session, in view of the fact that the issue was raised this afternoon, it seems that if price ceilings are to be imposed and a complete over-all control of prices and wages is to be instituted, the sooner we on this side of the aisle find out whether the Senators on the other side of the aisle are or are not backing the President's program, the better it will be in the consideration of legislation along that line. I was dumfounded this afternoon, when we were trying to find out whether there would be cooperation in connection with this bill, to observe that time and time again the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] refused to answer the question whether he would support title III of the proposed legislation. Certainly if we are to have unity of action and cooperation, the least we should know is whether the Democratic Senators, those on the other side of the aisle, will back up this bill or whether they will not back it up. Certainly we have a right to know that; and, Mr. President, believe me, I, for one, am going to find out whether the Senators want it or whether they do not want it. If the Senator from Wyoming, who was mentioned as a possible candidate on the Democratic ticket for Vice President, is not in favor of this bill the sooner we find out what his remedy is for curing the meat situation, the better off all of us will be in settling the great issue that is confronting us now.

So, Mr. President, I think we should do a great deal of thinking between now and Monday morning. I am going to do so.

I say once again that, so far as I am concerned, whether it is a special session or not, whether it was called for any reason other than in the interest of the American people, I am ready—yes, prayerfully anxious—to do anything that can be done to promote the welfare of the American people at this particular time; and I shall lend what leadership and ability and industry I have to see that proper measures are brought out and, I hope, are passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and then I hope they will receive the same kind of consideration when they reach the White House.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, August 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 30 (legislative day of July 28), 1948:

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. (Judge Fennell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 7, 1948.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, district of Alaska. (Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948.)

SUPREME COURT OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Emil C. Peters, term expired.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Albert M. Cristy, elevated.

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

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

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by Thy mercies we are spared and by Thy power we are sustained. Inspire us daily to live and labor in faithfulness and in the fear of the Lord. Establish within us those loyalties and integrities which cannot be shaken.

We pray that we may be more responsive to Thy voice, calling us to minister to the needs of humanity with hearts of compassion and hands of helpfulness.

Grant that our minds may be impervious to all thoughts of personal aggrandizement. Deliver us from every selfish propensity and from those attitudes which are alien to the spirit of the Master.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 30, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators desire to present matters for insertion in the RECORD. I feel that I should not be in a position of being accused of farming out time. I desire to comply with the mandate laid down by the President pro tempore at the beginning of the special session. Therefore I shall be glad to yield for insertions and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

routine matters; but if Senators wish to make speeches, I trust they will do so in their own time.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

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

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the sixth special session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico for the period May 14 to 21, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIM PAID BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, the payment of a tort claim by that Commission under the Federal Tort Claims Act from the date of the enactment of that act through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from K. A. Parker, president, Louisiana Democratic Civic Association, New Orleans, La., praying for the confirmation of the nomination of A. Miles Pratt to be collector of customs for the port of New Orleans; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from May Taylor, of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against any increase in the number of Federal employees, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Workmen's Circle of the National Executive Committee, signed by Ephim H. Jeshurin, president, and Joseph Baskin, general secretary, New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation submitted by the President to the special session of the Eightieth Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the States of New York and New Jersey, praying for the enactment of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, etc.; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Shanghai Refugee Council, Shanghai, China, praying immediate relief for 5,000 European displaced persons in Shanghai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRICE CONTROLS—RESOLUTION OF MONTANA STOCKGROWERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the sixty-fourth annual meeting of the Montana Stockgrowers' Association at Bozeman, Mont., May 13 to 15, 1948, protesting against price and rationing controls.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolution 16

"Price control

"Whereas President Truman has requested that Congress grant him authority to reinstate such price and rationing controls on food and other products as he deems necessary to regulate prices and consumption; and

"Whereas such regimentation was accepted by the American people as a war measure justified only by the danger to the Nation requiring emergency measures; and

"Whereas no such emergency can now be claimed to exist to justify such a sacrifice of individual rights and responsibilities, particularly when experience shows that the controls demanded are foredoomed to failure: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we again point out that production and efficient utilization provide the most effective controls upon prices and distribution, and we express our opposition to price and rationing controls."

This is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 16 adopted by vote of the members of the Montana Stockgrowers' Association in its sixty-fourth annual meeting at Bozeman, Mont., May 13, 14, 15, 1948.

Attest: E. A. PHILLIPS, *Secretary*.

HIGH-VOLTAGE LINE FROM STERLING, COLO., TO NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the board of directors of the Nebraska Association of Rural Public Power District and Membership Association, Inc., at its regular meeting held July 26, 1948, favoring the appropriation of sufficient funds to cover the engineering and construction costs of building a high-voltage line by the Bureau of Reclamation from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a dire shortage of electric power in the State of Nebraska due to the rapid increase in demand, the inability of the public power system (the hydros) to have had installed generating capacity sufficient to meet the need for electricity; and

Whereas this shortage of current, according to the estimates of well qualified persons will continue to be so serious and severe even after the plants now being rushed to completion by the Public Power System are put into operation in 1949, that use of electricity on the farms of Nebraska will have to be curtailed unless additional facilities are made available; and

Whereas this condition will continue until 1954, when it is expected current will be available to Nebraska from the Fort Randall project in South Dakota; and

Whereas the Reclamation Bureau has stated 30,000 kilowatts of electric energy from Bureau projects in Colorado could be made available by 1950–51 provided a transmission line is built from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr., and thus materially relieve the situation; and

Whereas it has been the desire of the Bureau of Reclamation to construct said transmission line, as soon as funds were available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Association of Rural Public Power District and Membership Association, Inc., urges Congress, while now in session, to appropriate sufficient funds to cover the engineering and construction costs of building a high-voltage line by the Bureau of Reclamation from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr.; and be it further

Resolved, That this association, representing and speaking for 33 rural electrification districts and associations in Nebraska, and the 65,000 farm and rural customers served by those projects, urgently requests the entire Nebraska delegation in Congress to place these resolutions before the proper congressional committees and to work diligently to secure the appropriation of said funds during this present session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Members of Congress, the rural electrification projects of Nebraska, and other interested persons and organizations.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE RUSSIAN ALLIANCE, INC.

During the delivery of the speech of Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia,

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut for an insertion in the RECORD with the understanding that I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). With the definite understanding that such yielding does not prejudice the rights of the Senator from Virginia to the floor, the request is, without objection, agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that yesterday afternoon, in Bridgeport, Conn., there was held a large meeting of American citizens of Russian extraction, several thousand being in attendance. Those present at that meeting adopted a resolution attesting to their loyalty to the United States of America as citizens, and to their belief in our fundamental principles of living and government, and in the American way of life.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

Be it resolved, That we, gathered here today, Sunday, August 1, 1948, in Stadler's Park, Bridgeport, Conn., comprising over 5,000 American citizens, and, as members of the Holy Ghost Russian Orthodox Church and the Carpatho Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, do hereby unanimously manifest and reaffirm our love and faith in the American way of life, and that we, as American citizens, are proud to demonstrate our complete loyalty to the United States Government, and to uphold the Constitution which guarantees us real freedom and equality. God bless America.

RUSSIAN ALLIANCE, INC.,
JOHN POPP, *Chairman*,
STEPHEN JANKURA, *Cochairman*.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2916. A bill for the relief of Donato Dipinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2917. A bill to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation and to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2918. A bill for the relief of Emery and Eleanor Nussbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2919. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain veterans' housing corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MORSE) introduced Senate bill 2920, to require payment to certain employees of the District of Columbia of the additional compensation authorized by the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2921. A bill for the relief of Antonia Raczyk Drozdowski; and

S. 2922. A bill for the relief of Helena B. M. Rebalska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION SECONDING THE NOMINATION OF SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the Democratic National Convention, seconding the nomination of Senator BARKLEY for the Vice Presidency of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

COL. JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him concerning the distinguished record of Col. James P. S. Devereux, United States Marine Corps, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RALPH E. BECKER AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, before the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia on June 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY H. GRAHAM MORRISON TO THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF TENNESSEE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. H. Graham Morrison, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, to the sixty-seventh annual session of the Bar Association of Tennessee on June 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three newspaper articles discussing the subject matter of Senate Resolution 200, relating to the counting of electoral votes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX AND PROHIBITION—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Poll Tax and Prohibition," published in the Daily Oklahoman of July 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE QUESTION OF INFLATION—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to inflation, entitled "How Serious and How Sincere," written by Walter Lippmann, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PAPER DOLLAR—EDITORIAL BY FELIX MORLEY

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Paper Dollar," written by Felix Morley, and published in the Pathfinder of July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW WORLD

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Priest Denies Charges DP Bill Is Anti-Catholic," published in the New World of July 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITIES IN UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON—EDITORIAL FROM THE SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The University and the Canwell Inquiry," published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—TESTIMONY OF MARRINER S. ECCLES

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Eccles Hits Back," published in the Washington Evening Star of Sunday, August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOLERANCE IN SOLUTION OF RACIAL PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "Gradual and Expanding Tolerance Seen as Only Way To Solve Racial Problems," by Dorothy Thompson, from the Washington Star of July 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. FERGUSON, the investigating committee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments granted permission to conduct the hearings.

By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. CAIN, the Committee on Banking and Currency was granted permission to sit during the session of the Senate today.

THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION—LETTER FROM JOHN W. STUDEBAKER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, by Mr. John W. Studebaker, former Commissioner of Education of the United States, which I believe it would be well worth while for every Member of the Senate to read.

I merely wish to point out that Mr. Studebaker for 14 years was Commissioner of Education, and made an outstanding contribution in that position for the benefit of education in the United States. I think some of the points he makes in his letter are of great concern to the country.

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

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 30, 1948.*

Hon. OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: In my letter of resignation, dated June 14, 1948, addressed to the President, I stated the basic reason why it seemed inadvisable for me to remain longer in the Government service beyond July 15; namely, the impossibility of providing for the proverbial rainy day with the top salary allowed for the Commissioner of Education.

Now, however, I desire to supplement various communications I sent you and conversations I had with you while in office on matters having to do with your policies of organization and administration, for the purpose of pointing out again some of the implications of the program you have had under way during recent months.

In summary it is my considered opinion that if your purposes and program are carried out you will do great harm not only to proper and adequate work of the United States Office of Education, but indeed also to the vital need for Federal participation in the support of equal educational opportunity among the States.

Before going further I wish to say that in presenting certain facts and points of view herein, I do not feel the slightest personal animus toward you or anyone else, regardless of the extent to which I obviously share with educators and the people in general a deep anxiety concerning the functions and control of education.

While of course many of your policies and administrative procedures affect the other constituent or operating organizations of the Federal Security Agency (U. S. Public Health Service, Social Security and Welfare Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Food and Drug Administration), I shall not presume to speak for them, although I know there exists great uneasiness and a markedly low morale among the personnel of all branches of the Agency. Nor do I wish here to write at length relative to the adverse effects of your program on education. I shall therefore confine my statements to some basic principles and a few illustrations.

A fundamental fault in your policies lies, it seems to me, in your failure to recognize that imaginative, competent, and productive work in any institution or agency is done by imaginative, competent, and zestful individuals who are happy in their work and who are eager to assume and carry responsibility, not by elaborate, regimental schemes of organization. Your program of administration therefore violates the great principle which has energized American life—the encouragement of personal responsibility; it violates the principle of decentralization and distribution of initiative and responsibility which results in great strength and productivity in the Nation because there is great strength and productivity among its millions of individual citizens.

Your program develops frustration and a feeling of futility among the employed personnel because individuals and units of individuals in the agency cannot control the means to the ends for which they are responsible.

The most successful private and public enterprises are those in which to the maximum practicable extent the spheres of authority

and of responsibility of individuals and of units of individuals are kept identical. Your program leaves responsibility with people down the line in the organization, so to speak, but strips away from them the control of the essential means by which their responsibility must be executed. You vest authority in your immediate staff members, but they are not and will not be held responsible by the people for any shortcomings or failures of the operating organizations of the agency. As frustration and futility develop, responsibility for the exercise of initiative, for the use of judgment, for securing results, also tends to move up the line. Here we see at work what might be called bureaucratic statism within a government originally dedicated to the principle of individual responsibility and respect for personality. Thorough regimentation always has been and always will be destructive of individual responsibility, a quality vital to the continued progress of our country.

Let me illustrate. For many years, always I assume since the United States Office of Education was established 81 years ago, and I know during 7 (1934–41) of the 14 years while I was Commissioner of Education, the articles, bulletins, addresses on educational matters were written freely by the professional people in the Office of Education in their respective special fields and were published. Sensing their individual responsibility, these professional people sought advice from competent persons from time to time, even though they were writing in their own fields of competence. So far as I know there was never any difficulty or embarrassment experienced by the Office of Education as a result of this policy.

After Pearl Harbor and during the war, there was a willingness that the OWI should check and approve all public statements. We were at war and citizens generally accepted necessary wartime controls. We in the Office of Education naturally assumed that with the war ended such controls of professional writing would be relinquished. They were not only continued, but they have been made more sweeping, complete, and time consuming within the Federal Security Agency. Now, any statement written by anyone in the Office of Education to be presented to any group or audience outside the Office, must be submitted to someone on your immediate staff for approval. These approvals, of course, involve statements ranging all the way from articles on such technical questions as planning science classrooms to the more general problems of education.

A specific example may be cited. Last April one of the staff members of the Office of Education, a well-trained man, with excellent experience in secondary education, was invited to speak to the high-school principals of the State of Massachusetts. He was to speak on the subject Teaching Zeal for American Democracy. Under an appropriation by Congress for 1948 made to the Office of Education, specific reference was made by the Congress to the need for such a program and especially for an educational program that would make clear to our young people the nature and tactics of communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

This man in the Office of Education himself decided to read his address. He prepared it. Consequently, under your regulations the address had to be submitted to your staff for approval. A few paragraphs of the address stressed the importance of developing means of teaching high-school pupils what communism really is, how inimical it is to the free world. Your staff member in a written comment said in part, "Much of this is very good. However, the Office of Education should, I am convinced, leave to the State Department and to the FBI the task of exposing the tactics and dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers."

Now in the light of the main purpose of Congress in making the afore-mentioned appropriation, an action obviously based on a clear recognition of the great need for an educational program that would adequately inform young people concerning the serious conflict between totalitarianism and freedom, is it not amazing that a leading educator in the United States Office of Education operating under a thoroughly bipartisan mandate of Congress should be told by one who had been put in a position to tell the Office of Education what it could and could not do, that the educational task of "exposing the tactics and the dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers" should be "left to the State Department and the FBI"?

All of us in education fully appreciate the parts that the State Department and the FBI should play in exposing Communists. These agencies know what their parts are and they know their function is not to work with schools and colleges on the development of educational programs dealing with this problem. To accept the dictum that the educational "task of exposing communism" should be left to these agencies would be tantamount to not having this vitally important educational task done at all, at least so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The result was that the man from the Office of Education abandoned the plan to present a written address. He had no time to try to revise it and to receive approval. He therefore held an off-the-record meeting with the Massachusetts high-school principals. In the meeting he said, ad libitum, all he had on his mind and heart about how education can help in the solution of a problem the magnitude of which is daily becoming more apparent to everyone. Thus, the representative of the Office of Education was able to express his opinion to the principals of Massachusetts, and that's what the principals wanted. They had not requested the opinion of someone on your immediate staff not known to them.

Another illustration. I made an address at the University of California at Los Angeles last March entitled "Education and the Fate of Democracy." Senator KNOWLAND, of California, as you know, is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education. The Senator, being very much interested in the whole subject, had the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the address, among other things, about communism, I said the following: "Whether or not the Communist Party in this country should be outlawed, I do not presume to say. But of this I am convinced: That no avowed or proven Communist is fit to be entrusted with the job of inculcating the American way of life in any school; and I make that statement on the rather obvious ground that education for American democracy cannot be entrusted to the enemies of American democracy."

Since the Office of Education has had only a relatively small appropriation for printing, every reasonable economy has been exercised in carrying out the major purpose of the Office as provided in its basic act; namely, to diffuse information about education.

The California address was printed on one sheet of paper. I requested enough copies so that one copy could be sent to each college, one to each public and private high school, and one to each superintendent of schools. The Office of Education requisition for these copies, to be paid for by the Office (about $250), was held up by one of your staff for several days and was only approved after he and I had engaged in a vigorous discussion of the matter in which for the most part he was trying to convince me that such language as I used in the address should be toned down and that if the address were released (this in spite of the fact that it had already been printed in the public record), he felt sure it would bring unfavorable reaction from a large number of educators. It was released and distributed in May. I have heard no objection from anyone.

Last December, copy was read for a special issue of the monthly periodical School Life. The issue was to be devoted entirely to contrasting totalitarianism and freedom and in pointing up various educational implications of the conflict. I was away when the manuscript, in accordance with your regulations, was submitted to your staff for approval. It was reported to me later that there was very definite resistance by another one of your staff to the entire publication. It was finally published and has been a Government best seller ever since.

These are only two illustrations of the way in which your policies leave the professional people in the Office of Education responsible for achieving fruitful results in helping to improve American education while transferring to your immediate staff the authority to control the means and procedures by which these professional people carry their responsibility. This divorcement of responsibility and authority with respect to the work of the Office of Education necessarily results in the same divorcement in the divisions and sections of the Office and with all of its individuals. The result is a strange feeling of uncertainty and fear among employees. The whole scheme is well designed to devitalize and demoralize the staff.

Apparently you do not feel that your present, large, immediate staff can control, to the extent you desire, the detailed activities within the Office of Education and the other constituent organizations of the agency having to do with publications, editorial work, and information services. Accordingly under date of May 26, last, you had an order issued under which you propose to centralize in your office all personnel now engaged in such services in the various constituent organizations, including the Office of Education. Under the order you propose to transfer 17 people from the supervision of the Office of Education to the administrative supervision of the office of the Administrator, in spite of the fact that the appropriation that supports these people was made to the Office of Education.

I pointed out in my memorandum under date of June 12, 1948, the inappropriateness of the proposal and ways in which it would, if executed, work to the disadvantage of the services which the Office of Education is expected to render. My purpose here is merely to reinforce the arguments I made in that memorandum. In it I tried to make clear the intimate relationships which exist between the services of these people and the work of all other persons in the Office. Verbally I had reported to you and other members of your staff that it has been the plan of the Office of Education to decentralize as much as possible among the several divisions of the Office of Education these types of services rather than to build up a large central staff even within the Office of Education. Eighty-one years of experience in the Office of Education proved the validity of the plans as formulated. Therefore it is not surprising that there should be among the personnel of the Office of Education such an unfavorable reaction to your proposal.

There can be no honest claim to economy in the transfer of administrative control which you propose. The 17 persons in the Office of Education have been working as hard and as efficiently as people could work. Besides, they have been working intelligently and enthusiastically because they were closely associated with the other people in the Office to whose work their services are directly related. Merely to aggregate them with others in a centralized organization operating at a greater distance from those with whom they are expected to work and to put them under the supervision of someone on your staff who is not primarily interested in

education will certainly reduce both their efficiency and enthusiasm, so far as education is concerned.

In another order issued by your office under date of June 12, entitled "Agency Office of Publications and Reports" the following statements are made:

In accordance with the Administrator's memorandum of May 26, relative to information service the following should be understood by all concerned:

1. There will be a central information office under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports.

2. Job classification sheets which have been applicable up to this time will be used until such time as it is possible to develop new sheets consistent with the organization to be established in the office of the Administrator.

3. As indicated in the original memorandum all persons will remain on the pay rolls of the constituents for the fiscal year 1949.

4. The 1950 budget will be prepared in such a way as to show in the Administrator's budget an Office of Publications and Reports consisting of the Office of Publications and Reports, Office of the Administrator, plus transfers made by the Congress from the Social Security Administration Informational Service. Other information jobs will be budgeted so that they will appear on the pay rolls of the constituents.

Apart from the gross weaknesses in the proposed arrangement which I have tried to point out in this letter and elsewhere, does it not seem even to you illogical that the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency should be expected to prepare and justify appropriation estimates to include persons to be carried on the pay rolls of the respective constituents to work in the fields under discussion, but to work under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports on your staff? If it is logical and proper that these persons should be centralized into one unit for the Agency in general to be supervised administratively by your Director, would it not also seem logical and proper that they should be supported on a pay roll secured under an appropriation made in terms of the policy of administration which you propose to follow?

In other words, why do you propose to have them carried on the pay rolls supported by appropriations made by Congress to respective constituent units of the Agency, and then put them under the administrative supervision of someone on the Administrator's office staff? If they should be thus supervised (of course I do not believe they should) why are they not to be justified in the 1950 budget estimates as a part of the Administrator's office?

Under the arrangement you propose I do not see how Members of the Congress can act intelligently as they consider appropriations which must of necessity, be related to lines of organizational administration. Your plan seems to me to make nonsense of the serious efforts of Congressmen to consider requested appropriations in terms of the location of the direct responsibility for the administration of the functions to be supported by the appropriations.

No doubt you think of the Federal Security Agency as just one large monolithic welfare organization. Consequently you think of education as merely one phase of welfare. When the problem is understood, very few people will agree with your conception. But if you really believe that the relationships between social security and education, health, and education, and social security and health are exceedingly intimate and that education as a function in this country should be quite exclusively related to and integrated with health and welfare functions (I certainly do not), then you should ask the Congress for a single appropriation for a Federal Office of Welfare. But since the function of education is not a welfare function, since it necessarily represents a wide range of human interests and operates through well-defined agencies and institutions, it should be supported by an appropriation made to the United States Office of Education in terms of justifications presented to Congress and break-downs therein determined.

These are some of the evidences of how your policy and program seems to obliterate the identity and the unity of action of the respective constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency; namely, the United States Public Health Service, Social Security Administration, United States Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration. There are others. Your order requiring the elimination of the words "United States" before the term "Public Health Service" and "Office of Education" in every case where it could be appropriately done; your suggestion that you did not see the sense in having an annual report for each of the constituent units, but only one for the Federal Security Agency as a whole; your policy to have yourself quoted in public releases even on technical matters of statistics and other reports of a factual character based on research of highly professional technicians instead of having these technicians and their immediate supervisors quoted exclusively, all point to a trend toward centralization which is, as I have stated above, destructive of morale, of initiative, and of the kind of productive work on the part of a large number of employees to which the tax-paying public is entitled.

Finally the capstone of the argument against the centralization of control which you are developing, at least so far as education is concerned, is to be found in the fact that you are admittedly a partisan politician. You work hard for your party. Personally I have the most wholesome respect for our party system of government in the United States. I have never met finer men and women than those elected by both major parties to membership in the National Congress. But there is a deep-rooted tradition in this country, born of the harrowing experiences of the centuries, that the function of education in a democracy should be completely removed from partisanship. Political party control of public education is destructive of democracy and has proved to be so down through the years and especially in recent decades in Italy, Germany, Russia, and Japan.

Being a partisan, you secure to the extent possible, as your immediate associates persons who share your partisanship. Under the direction of yourself and of these associates you move constantly to centralize all policies, all approvals, in short all control of the activities of the constituent organizations, including education. These controls contemplate the approval of personnel, of budgets, of substantive programs, and practically all details connected therewith. I am certain that such management of education on the Federal level is not what the great rank and file of the people of this country desire. On the contrary, they want the United States Office of Education to provide an adequate staff of competent professional educators who are in their positions to carry out the nonpartisan purposes for which the Office was established; they want a continuation of the devoted and completely nonpolitical professional service to American education that characterizes the work of the superior men and women who now comprise the staff of the Office of Education.

The American people may justly be proud of the personnel of the United States Office of Education. Every person in the office has been selected through Civil Service in open competition and solely on the basis of his personal and professional qualifications. In my 14 years of intimate association with the employees in the office, I never saw the slightest indication on the part of any one of them of any political party preference. Their lives are not actuated by partisanship; their backgrounds, their professional pride, their sense of obligation to true education in a democracy guide them in an unswerving devotion to the high calling of teaching. These are the kinds of people who in the Federal Government and in the States can really help education through schools and colleges to make its unique contribution to the preservation of our American free way of life. They are giving their lives passionately to that great objective. It isn't strange then that they, together with their colleagues throughout the country and citizens in general, regardless of political affiliation, should resent any attempts to color education with partisanship and cause its policies and processes to yield advantages to a political party.

This letter has become much longer than I intended. That is because there is so much to say on the subject.

I am sending copies of this letter to Dr. Willard Givens and Dr. E. B. Norton, who are, respectively, the executive secretaries of the National Education Association and the National Council of Chief State School Officers, organizations which, among many others, always have been active in efforts to secure a more adequate United States Office of Education and to insure such policies and methods of administration of educational activities in the Federal Government as would encourage sound programs of education in the States. I am also sending copies to the two chairmen of the Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Office of Education, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND and Representative FRANK B. KEEFE.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN W. STUDEBAKER.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am indebted to the Reverend Father Ralph G. Kutz, of Festus, Mo., for calling my attention to a document of historic interest. It is a letter written by the Honorable Harry S. Truman, at that time a Senator from Missouri, to the editor of the St. Louis Star-Times, and published on the editorial page of that newspaper under date of March 6, 1944.

A tax bill had just been vetoed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Senator Truman complained that the language used by President Roosevelt in his veto message was unnecessarily harsh. Senator Truman wrote:

Had the President returned the tax bill with a plain statement that he did not think it produced enough revenue and would have to have one to cause a heavier tax return I don't think there is a doubt in the world but what both the Senate and the House of Representatives would have supported the veto, but when he attacked the integrity and the intelligence of the Senate and the House of Representatives he got just exactly what was coming to him. The vast majority of the legislative branch of the Government is just as hard working and just as patriotic as any other branch of the Government, and it is my opinion they are much more patriotic than some of the administrators who have been charged with the carrying out of the war effort on the home front. A little more common sense in the administrative approach to things that have to be done and a little less demagoguery for the purpose of appealing to the ignorant and uninformed would make it much easier to carry on the

war effort and to win the war that much more quickly.

Senator Truman continued further:

The bulwark of free Government is the elected legislative branch of the Government which holds the purse strings, and which has the power to levy taxes upon the people to meet the expense of the Government. I honestly think the founding fathers believed the Congress to be the most important branch of the Government or they would not have outlined its organization and its powers first in the Constitution.

May I interpolate that this reference to "the purse strings" is reminiscent of President Truman's impromptu remarks preceding his Jefferson-Jackson day dinner address, on February 19, 1948, when he declared: "Conditions are too grave in the world at this time to put a Congress in control of the purse strings of the country."

Senator Truman, in his letter to the Star-Times, paid his respects to the press of the United States in the following language:

Ever since I have been in the Senate it has been the policy of the majority of the press of the United States to make it appear that the legislative branch of the Government is made up of morons and that there are no men of intelligence in Congress. That policy has been pursued by the press of the United States and your editorial is no exception. When it was in the public interest for the Congress to cooperate with the President in carrying out the program to meet the depression the press almost unanimously called us a bunch of pin-heads and rubber-stamps, but when we assert any rights under the Constitution to control the appropriation of money and the levying of taxes we get exactly the same result. Now what is it you want—a dictatorship or a republic? For my own part I want a republic.

Finally Senator Truman summed up the proper relationship between the executive and regislative branches of the Government. He said, referring to President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

He must merit our respect just as we merit his, and demagogic veto messages will not create that respect.

I am glad to share this interesting letter with my colleagues of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD in full as a part of my remarks.

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

EDITOR, STAR-TIMES:

I read with much interest your editorial with regard to the Barkley incident, and I am somewhat surprised at your slant on that affair. No man on earth is perfect—I don't care whether he is President of the United States or the editor of a great metropolitan newspaper. There is not a possibility for any man to be right all the time, particularly when he has a big job to perform as the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the armed forces has at this time.

The President has been consistently neglecting his political contacts ever since 1936, and in my opinion Senator BARKLEY should have kicked over the traces long ago. Remember, that in a republic politics is government. When you imply that the Congress has no intelligence and that it is merely a place where men of no brains congregate I rather think you are doing the bulwark of free government a slight injustice, to say the least.

Had the President returned the tax bill with a plain statement that he did not think it produced enough revenue and would have to have one to cause a heavier tax return, I don't think there is a doubt in the world but what both the Senate and the House of Representatives would have supported the veto; but when he attacks the integrity and the intelligence of the Senate and the House of Representatives he got just exactly what was coming to him. The vast majority of the legislative branch of the Government is just as hard working and just as patriotic as any other branch of the Government, and it is my opinion they are much more patriotic than some of the administrators who have been charged with the carrying out of the war effort on the home front. A little more common sense in the administrative approach to things that have to be done and a little less demagoguery for the purpose of appealing to the ignorant and uninformed would make it much easier to carry on the war effort and to win the war that much more quickly.

The administrative management of the whole program has been a headache, and I don't think anyone is in a position to know more about it than I am. It has been my job to find the weak points and suggest that they be remedied.

The bulwark of free government is the elected legislative branch of the government which holds the purse strings, and which has the power to levy taxes upon the people to meet the expense of the Government. I honestly think the founding fathers believed the Congress to be the most important branch of the Government or they would not have outlined its organization and its powers first in the Constitution.

I have always been of the opinion that the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives should not under any circumstances have any interest or any personal connections with the executive branch of the Government. I think it is our business to outline the policies and then follow them through by investigation to find out if these policies are being carried out as the people intended them to be carried out. I believe in party responsibility, and when we depart from party responsibility and a two-party system with a strong and virile opposition we will simply depart from free government.

No man in an executive position can carry on his program and the politics [sic] outlined by the legislative branch unless he has an administrative set-up which is loyal to him and which will work with him.

I think the President was right in taking members of the opposition party in his Cabinet when the war broke out. He was endeavoring to get full cooperation from all sections of the country, but when he puts the operation of the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board in the hands of his bitter enemies he can expect to get the results he is now getting from the representatives of the people. These local administrators who are against the President make the enforcement of these distasteful laws just as hard and inconvenient to the people as they possibly can.

Ever since I have been in the Senate it has been the policy of the majority of the press of the United States to make it appear that the legislative branch of the Government is made up of morons and that there are no men of intelligence in Congress. That policy has been pursued by the press of the United States and your editorial is no exception. When it was in the public interest for the Congress to cooperate with the President in carrying out the program to meet the depression the press almost unanimously called us a bunch of pinheads and rubber stamps, but when we assert any rights under the Constitution to control the appropriation of money and the levying of taxes we get exactly the same result. Now what is it you want—a dictatorship or a republic? For my own part, I want a republic. I think Senator BARKLEY did a heroic thing and I think he did the right thing.

I have been a consistent supporter of the President and expect to continue that policy, but I have never hesitated to call attention to mistakes and bad administration when I know they exist. I shall continue to do just that. As I said in the beginning, no man is perfect and no man can be entrusted with too much power. The Congress is the only check on administrative mistakes and administrative power.

The Congress has given the President all the power and all the money he has asked for to meet every emergency as it has come up. They have done that for 11 years, and they will continue to do it. However, he must merit our respect just as we merit his, and demagogic veto messages will not create that respect.

HARRY S TRUMAN,
United States Senate.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask to whom the letter was addressed?

Mr. KEM. It was addressed to the editor of the St. Louis Star-Times, and appeared on the editorial page of that newspaper on Monday, March 6, 1944, page 10.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement with regard to the international wheat agreement, now pending before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Since 1941, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and in my votes on the floor of the Senate, I have gone along, have supported in the main, the bipartisan foreign policy which we decided held the best prospects for a peaceful postwar world, and for the future prosperity and happiness and security of the people of the United States. I supported the United Nations Charter, the British loan, Bretton Woods, Greek-Turkish aid, the Marshall program, approving the principle in general that we could well afford to take the calculated risks involved in the interest of a better and safer world.

The most of these programs have been based on the United States giving much and taking little—aside from the calculated risks involved. I am not criticizing that at all. As I say, I went along, and am not voicing any regrets that I did so.

Now comes up the international wheat agreement, one of the few proposals which at least attempt to give some direct returns, in the future, to an important segment of the national economy of the United States. And I am disturbed to find a disposition in some quarters to reject the proposed agreement, almost, I might say, without real consideration of its purported merits and demerits.

The proposed agreement, in the nature of a treaty between the United States and 35 other nations, is a well-considered attempt by the 36 nations concerned to try out, for a 5-year period, a plan by which the three nations which ordinarily produce wheat in surplus quantities agree to supply 500,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat annually to the 33 nations which ordinarily have to import wheat if their people have enough bread to eat.

On the other hand, the 33 importing nations agree to take 500,000,000 bushels of wheat from the 3 exporting nations during the 5-year trial period. The United States share of wheat exports covered by the agreement is 185,000,000 bushels. That is

considerably better than 100,000,000 bushels more than we can expect to export after the world gets going again, judging from past history. The other 315,000,000 bushels are divided between Canada and Australia.

It is true that Argentina and Soviet Russia, the other two big exporting nations, have refused to come into the agreement. Argentina stayed out, I take it, for economic reasons, gambling she can do better on her own. Russia's reasons for staying out, I take it, are more political than economic. What surplus Russia has we may expect her to use to further Russian political interests.

I am aware that our present foreign policy apparently requires that the United States, at times, consider the interests and policies of the rest of the world ahead of our own interests. But I do not understand that we are obligated to take either Russia or Argentina as our guides in all matters relating to our own welfare.

As of today, I would not say that our wheat growers would be satisfied with the range of prices provided in the agreement. These are, as the members of the committee know, a maximum of $2 a bushel (in storage at Fort William or Port Arthur, Canada) for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat. According to the Department of Agriculture and Herman A. Praeger, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau, that would mean around $1.87 at Kansas City. According to the grain trade, $1.78 at Kansas City. The minimum would be $1.50 this marketing year (same basing points) and would drop 10 cents a year to $1.10 minimum the fifth year.

The prices for each year would be fixed by agreements between the governments; sales would be through private trade agencies, in theory at least. I will say that the grain trade and the millers have made very good arguments against entering into any such agreements. I am not particularly disputing the points they make. I realize the possibility that the agreement recognizes the possibility of state trading rather than private trading in international trade. I do not know whether this particular agreement will add much to that situation, under present world conditions, nor in the 5 years covered by this agreement. We are not living in an ideal world today, certainly not from the viewpoint of private enterprise.

I must admit also that even the maximum price under the agreement is below the Government support price for this marketing year. And that the minimum-price scale is below what wheat growers, at least, anticipate will be the support price during the period. And that will call for the Federal Treasury to make up the difference on such wheat as is exported under the agreement.

But I also would call your attention to the fact that we have the support-price guaranties without reference to this agreement. And I leave it to you if it would not be better for the Federal Government to have a guaranteed market for 185,000,000 bushels of export wheat, sold admittedly at some loss, than to have to take over the entire surplus and hold it, threatening thereby bigger holdover surpluses for each following year, and ultimately greater losses to the Treasury—and to our own wheat growers in the long run?

It is probably just a matter of a few years—perhaps not too many months—until the United States is going to face again the problem of wheat surpluses. The more we can export, the smaller the surpluses, and the less the necessity of Government controls of production and of marketing. It may well be that the private trade will fare better under this agreement than it will under the more stringent controls which could follow the piling up of undisposable surpluses.

In this connection I want to call your attention to two paragraphs from the Midyear Economic Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, submitted to the Congress last week. I read the following, starting on page 44 of the report:

"Despite our high degree of industrialization, the tremendous importance of agriculture cannot be overlooked. The world shortage of foods and other products of agricultural origin, continuing up to this year, has had an immense inflationary impact upon the whole price structure through the relation that farm prices have to the cost of living and to industrial wages, prices, and profits. Although the full effects will not be felt for some time, greater abundance in basic agricultural crops should be of signal aid in the checking of inflation and progressive working out of stable relationships.

"That end," the report continues—and it is this paragraph to which I would especially direct your attention—"That end would not be promoted if the enlargement in supply of farm products were to coincide with some serious curtailment of demand to produce a collapse of farmers' incomes. Such a collapse shortly after World War I spread to rural merchants and bankers, to manufacturers of farm equipment and consumer goods, and to other commodity markets. But a repetition of such a debacle today is precluded by a policy of farm-income supports, implemented by procedures worked out and tested over the past 20 years, though not yet perfected."

Just two points in connection with that report. First, the danger of too low farm prices in their cumulative effect on the rest of the national economy; and, second, the fact that we already are pledged to price-support programs. Losses to the Federal Treasury may well be greater from supporting wheat prices if we do not have the export outlets which it is hoped this agreement will provide, than if the Government has to buy wheat without that export market.

I do not pretend to guarantee that this international wheat agreement will work out as intended. I admittedly am not as hopeful over all these international agreements as some other members of this committee. But I do say that if this committee is as strong for international agreements and promoting international trade as it has recorded itself in the past few years, it certainly should recommend this agreement favorably to the Senate.

I will say one thing more. When the National Grange and the National Farmers Union are in agreement, and both also agree with the American Farm Bureau Federation on some action to be taken, you may rest assured either that American agriculture is facing a desperate situation, or the proposition has a lot of merit from the viewpoint of these three great farm organizations. I hope the resolution is favorably reported to the Senate.

THE FARMER'S STILTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Farmer's Stilts," published in the July 29, 1948, issue of the Omaha Evening World-Herald. While we may not agree with all the thoughts expressed in the editorial, I am sure it will be interesting to the Members of the Senate.

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

THE FARMER'S STILTS

There seemed to be a note of panic in the Department of Agriculture's request to farmers the other day to reduce next year's wheat acreage by 8 percent.

There should have been.

For it appears that the old problem of farm surpluses, which vanished during the war, is back with us again. This is it.

Bumper crops of wheat and oats are assured. A huge crop of corn is in sight. The latest Government estimate was 3,300,000,000 bushels, but some grain men are guessing that the crop may hit 4,000,000,000.

Grain prices, in consequence, have been skidding. Wheat has been selling in Omaha at $2.14 a bushel—but only because the seller could not find elevator space to take advantage of the Government loan of $2.24 a bushel. New corn is still selling at 10 cents a bushel over the loan price, but is likely to be down there soon.

Plainly, a lot of 1948's grain harvest is going to the Government, through the device of Government crop loans. Well-informed grain men think that eventually the Government will be the owner of about a billion bushels of the 1948 crop. If so, it will have about $2,000,000,000 invested in it.

In recent years, because of the abnormally heavy demand for food, the only crop the Government has had to buy in quantity has been potatoes. Potatoes may furnish a guide as to what will happen with grain.

In 1946 the Government spent $93,000,000 buying potatoes. In 1947 it spent $40,000,000. So far in 1948 it has spent about $16,000,000, and the potato harvest is just beginning. To get rid of its unwanted surplus, the Government has burned potatoes, thrown them in the ocean, and sold them at 15 cents a hundred to people who would promise to feed them to animals rather than eat them themselves.

The Government has exhorted farmers to raise fewer potatoes. But why should they? One Nebraska potato grower this year has raised 500 bushels of potatoes to the acre and sold them to the Government at $1.60 per bushel. It will take more than exhortation to make him give up a crop that returns $800 an acre.

The potato story, when repeated with grain, will be a lot bigger and more expensive. Intolerably expensive, maybe.

What's the cure?

Acreage control? Remembering the troubles of the 1930's, everybody shudders at the thought.

Chemurgy—that is, the use of farm products as industrial raw materials? This offers a shining prospect in time, but no short-term solution.

A theoretically ideal method of disposing of surpluses would be to do away with support prices and let the law of supply and demand operate. Sold cheaply enough, almost anything will be used, and certainly food. And, with the demand for food still great, it seems unlikely that prices would go so low as to be ruinous to the farmer.

Yet a case can be made for continuance of some sort of support. Labor has a backstop in its unions, the manufacturers of basic commodities have one in cartels and trade agreements, many smaller businessmen one in the various fair-price laws. Only the farmer, except for Government intervention, sells in a free market.

The Aiken-Hope Farm Act, passed by the last Congress to be effective next year, aims at eliminating the rigidity of farm prices by instituting a system of flexible price supports. The main question about the Aiken-Hope Act is whether it is flexible enough. It provides a floor of 60 percent of parity rather than the present 90 percent. Even 60 percent of parity may price some farm products out of the market, or at least encourage huge surpluses.

In the face of this situation, some of the self-appointed friends of the farmer in Congress seem to be out of touch with reality. They are demanding that the 90 percent of parity—and even more—be restored.

Such proposals are nothing short of madness. They would simply compound present insanities—such as the fact that there is too much grain, but grain is too costly to feed to

animals, so the animal population is abnormally low, and the housewife who wants to buy a steak can't afford one.

If matters go on as they are now, or even as they may be under the more sensible Aiken-Hope Act, catastrophe is all but inevitable. A catastrophe that will make the fiasco of the old Hoover Farm Board, which bought up surpluses until it went busted, look small.

The simple fact is that—the planners and the professional friends of the farmer to the contrary—agriculture cannot stay on stilts forever. The inexorable laws of economics will chop the stilts away, and the longer the chopping is postponed the worse the crash will be. The sooner agriculture becomes a normal part of the economy—with minimum safeguards against too great a shock—the better.

REDUCTION OF POSTAGE RATES ON RELIEF PARCELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to Hon. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, under date of July 30, 1948, in relation to reduction of postage rates on relief parcels to countries behind the iron curtain.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 30, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: I am writing to you on the matter of a possible reduction of postage rates on relief parcels sent to individuals in lands behind the iron curtain. As you know, the Economic Cooperation Administration, as authorized by law, has enabled a 4-cent-per-pound reduction on parcel post rates for relief parcels going to the Western European nations participating in the European recovery program.

A few days ago, Mr. Hoffman, Administrator of E. C. A., in response to a letter of inquiry from me, stated that postage rate reductions could not be made on parcels going to people in Poland, for example, because Poland is not one of the participating countries as defined in the economic cooperation law. Therefore, at this time I should like to ask your kind and sympathetic consideration of my proposal that the Administration recommend a change in policy so that parcels going to the iron curtain lands can also be facilitated by postage rate reductions.

It seems to me that the following points justify such action:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC RELATIONS THROUGH PARCELS

1 The best public relations in the world for America and the American way of life consists in the relief parcels going abroad. It has been my experience during a European trip that the billions of dollars sent by the American Nation, as such, were comparatively unappreciated, whereas the hundreds of thousands of relief parcels sent by American citizens, as such, to their kin and acquaintances abroad, were tremendously appreciated. This proved to be a particularly powerful means of propaganda in the cold war when relief parcels were supplemented by individual letters sincerely written by American citizens to their kinfolk abroad.

I firmly believe that a pound of baloney sent in a relief parcel is worth 100,000 words of verbal baloney sent by American short wave to lands behind the iron curtain. Our verbal propaganda, surreptitiously heard by a relatively few people listening to radio sets, cannot possibly be compared in its limited effectiveness to the powerful appeal of United States relief parcels. I do not underestimate the value of verbal propaganda, but Europe's hungry stomachs are far more concerned with baloney that people can eat rather than baloney that they presumably hear.

CAPITALIZING ON ANTI-RUSSIAN SENTIMENT

2. The Russian cement in the iron curtain is apparently cracking. Marshal Tito's defiance of the Cominform indicates something of the tremendous unrest and dissatisfaction among the peoples supposedly under complete Russian domination. If we can get relief parcels through, we will serve to increase the bonds with our own land and further untie the bonds with Russia.

3. America fortunately this year is blessed with a superabundance of crops. If some of our abundance can be translated into relief parcels and sent to Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, untold good for United States relations can develop.

RELIEVING OUR CITIZENS OF HEAVY COSTS

4. If we can secure postage rate reductions on these relief parcels going to lands behind the iron curtain, we will help the millions of Americans who have relatives abroad to make additional shipments. I need not tell you what a heavy financial drain it is upon American citizens with relatives, for example, in Poland, who have to bear the very heavy charges for postal rates.

These American citizens with kinfolks in lands behind the iron curtain are taxpayers, and, after all, they, too, are paying for the cost of the Economic Cooperation Administration. It is only fair that they be not discriminated against in their postage rate-reduction policy as against Americans with kin in the western European countries, who are fortunately benefiting from the rate reduction.

PROMOTING SAFE, PROMPT DELIVERY

I feel that this policy of facilitating some of these relief parcels should be supplemented by our postal officials in doing everything possible to insure the safe and prompt delivery of these parcels in the iron-curtain lands.

LOYALTY OF OUR CITIZENS FROM EASTERN EUROPEAN LANDS LIKE POLAND

I know that I need not mention that Americans with kinfolk in these lands have proven their loyalty to our way of life. Moreover, to cite one country without in any way underestimating other countries, the people of Poland have throughout their history demonstrated their undying loyalty to the very principles of liberty and freedom which gave birth to our Nation. It seems to me that in the spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski, yes, in the spirit of Kossuth, and all the other European patriots who helped give birth to freedom in America and/or in their own lands, we can maintain aflame the lamp of liberty and the hope of liberty behind the iron curtain by a policy such as I have recommended.

Thanking you for your kind attention to this subject, and assuring you of my highest esteem and of my appreciation of your always prompt and thorough response, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the past few days there has been speculation expressed in the public press and otherwise as to whether, in view of the recent legislative history, it would be necessary for the President to send the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners back to the Senate for confirmation. I can say, Mr. President, that there is not the slightest reason to believe that there is any necessity for the resubmission of any of the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners for either appointment or confirmation.

On Saturday last I addressed a letter to the President of the United States setting forth the legislative history of House bill 6402, recently enacted, which extended the terms of the Commissioners. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

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

JULY 30, 1948.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Within the past few days several news stories have been circulated in the press and otherwise speculating upon the possibility that it might be necessary for the resubmission of the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners for confirmation, under the Term Extension Act. While the terms of this Extension Act, H. R. 6402, seem unquestionably clear in providing that the terms of the present Commissioners are extended to June 30, 1950, without any necessity for reappointment; nevertheless, I respectfully submit certain legislative history to you for your consideration.

Under the terms of the act, H. R. 6402, which is identical with S. 2589, it is provided that—

"The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office prior to June 30, 1950, shall expire at midnight on June 30, 1950."

In the report on H. R. 6402 made to the House of Representatives by the House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and in the report made to the Senate on S. 2589 made by the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it is stated as follows:

"The passage of this bill will immediately give assurance of uninterrupted continuity in office for 2 years and 2 months following the date of this report during which the present Commission can continue without disruption or without the necessity of reappointment."

In the debate on H. R. 6402 in the Senate, the following discussion was had between Senator CONNALLY and myself, found on page 9062 of the RECORD of June 19, 1948:

"Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

"Mr. CONNALLY. Under the arrangement [the arrangement to extend the terms until June 30, 1950], there would be no need of confirmation; would there?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

"Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, this measure would automatically extend the present terms of office; would it?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. We would simply take August 1, 1948, out of the calendar, really, and would insert in its place June 30, 1950.

"Mr. CONNALLY. So the Senate would not have to act on the question of confirmation; is that correct?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is quite correct."

Again, on page 9072 of the RECORD of June 19, 1948, in a discussion between Senator BARKLEY and Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, the following question and answer occurred:

"Mr. BARKLEY. If the bill is passed, as I understand, it will extend the terms for 2 years without confirmation. Is that the fact?

"Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true."

As shown by the committee reports to each House of Congress on this measure and as established in the legislative history of the debate, it therefore seems clear beyond con-

troversy that it was the complete understanding and clear opinion and intent of both Houses of the Congress that this measure would provide for the extension of the terms of Commissioners appointed prior to June 30, 1950, up to that date without the necessity of reappointment or confirmation. At no time was it advocated by any Member of either House of Congress that any other purpose or intent was contained in the legislation, and I assure you that it is my clear and firm opinion that this was the exact and unchallenged intention of the Congress in connection with this legislation.

I give you this history and these views because of the speculative stories that have become public. I regret exceedingly the recurring agitation of atomic-energy administrative matters, and I assure you that I shall continue my efforts toward orderly, vigorous development of our atomic-energy program so that its evaluation and progress can be free of bias or temporary expediency.

I have the honor to remain,

Respectfully yours,

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask a question or two?

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Florida be good enough to withhold his questions until we can have a quorum call?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. 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	Hickenlooper	Myers
Baldwin	Hill	O'Conor
Barkley	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Butler	Jenner	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Kem	Robertson, Wyo
Capper	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cooper	Langer	Smith
Cordon	Lodge	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stennis
Downey	McCarthy	Taft
Dworshak	McClellan	Taylor
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McKellar	Thye
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hayden	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], are necessarily absent.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

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

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent, attending the funeral services of a close friend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senate has now been in session 1 week. After the Senate was ready to proceed with business and take up legislation, a motion was made by the junior Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, which all Senators, I believe, have heard discussed.

The motion to take up this particular piece of legislation has been debated for several days. I think it is quite obvious that if it is to be considered at this emergency session of Congress the subject matter of the legislation must be brought before the Senate without further debate.

The question of civil rights, and especially the question of the poll tax, is generations old. While it is true that each and every time the legislation is brought up for discussion and debate there are some new features, yet in general the legislation before us really has nothing new in it. It is my opinion that we could discuss this motion for days, and there would be little new evidence upon which those who wish to resist the motion to take up the bill could advance their cause. Certainly in all fairness the proponents of the anti-poll-tax legislation should have their day in court on the subject matter rather than on the motion to take up.

As acting majority leader I point out that time and again on other occasions, even though I did not agree with the subject matter involved, I did my level best to bring legislation before the Senate for consideration in order that it might be discussed, and that the Senate might take action.

So, in that spirit, Mr. President, in the spirit of full cooperation, in the spirit of fair play, in the spirt of permtting Senators who wish to discuss this measure to do so and to have a vote upon the subject matter, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 5 o'clock this afternoon, the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon the motion now pending, which is a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election of national officers, and that the time between the hours of 3 o'clock and 5 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the motion, and controlled, respectively, by myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the request which has been made by the Senator from Nebraska for cooperation in this matter. I like to cooperate with the Senator when it is possible to do so. However, I am afraid that I miss the sweet spirit of Christian charity with which it is said the request is clothed. I know of no reason why this matter should be brought to such an early conclusion. On Thursday of last week the Senator from Nebraska moved to proceed to the consideration of this measure. The motion has been before the Senate in two normal legislative sessions. I respectfully submit—and I am sure the RECORD will bear me out—that at least half the time has been consumed in the discussion of extraneous matters by those who say they are in favor of the bill which the Senator from Nebraska seeks to bring before the Senate.

Those who are opposed to this measure have discussed the merits of the questions and the reasons why the Senate should not proceed to the consideration of the bill at this time. The Senator from Nebraska stated, at the time he made his motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill, that there was no other legislation ready for the Senate to consider. I am quite sure that the calendar of the Senate will reflect the fact that no bills have been reported by the committees since that statement was made.

The Senator from Nebraska has referred to the fact that this was emergency legislation, being considered in an emergency session of the Senate. Mr. President, at the time of the ratification of the Constitution 159 years ago poll taxes or other property qualifications more onerous were required of all voters; and yet we are told that this is a great emergency, and for that reason we should agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Every one of the Original Thirteen States, at the time the States ratified the Constitution, had property qualifications for voting, most of them much more onerous than a dollar poll tax, in those cases in which the States did not have a poll tax.

Mr. President, we who are referred to slightingly, in the sense of opprobrium, as being southern Democrats, shall seek to find time to present our case to the country. I realize that this is a Presidential campaign year; and we do not desire to be caught between the upper and nether millstones of the two major parties fighting for votes of certain minority groups in this campaign. We shall not willingly surrender any right we have to present this question to the country. Therefore, I object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what the Senator from Georgia has said may apply to the consideration of the poll-tax bill itself, but I cannot see how it applies to the motion to take up the bill. We

have spent 3 days on a motion to take up the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Two days. The Senator from Ohio himself used considerable time in discussing extraneous matters.

Mr. TAFT. If we were to spend 2 days on every motion to take up a bill in the Senate, we could never get anything done at any time.

What we are urging is that the motion to take up the bill be voted upon. Is the Senator willing to state any time at which he would be willing to vote on the motion to take up the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not care to commit myself at this time as to a time when we would consent to vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. We are operating under very unusual conditions. Though the cry of politics is being hurled all over the city, and the motives of every person are suspect, there are those of us who sincerely believe that we have a case against the bill, and that if we can ever get it across to the people of the United States, they will compel its withdrawal from consideration by the Senate.

We are laboring under tremendous handicaps. We who live in the South do not control the means of communicating news over the country. We do not control the press of the Nation, the commentators, and the airways, to influence public opinion. We ought to be able to debate a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill for 3 or 4 days without anyone complaining about it. This year we spent 5 or 6 weeks on the St. Lawrence waterway bill, and not once was the cry of "filibuster" raised. As soon as one of these political bills aimed at the South is brought up, almost before we have an opportunity to take the floor, the cry of "filibuster" is raised. It is raised in the newspapers; it is raised over the air waves; and the merits of the issue are completely obscured by the publicity which goes out about the alleged filibuster. We have never yet had a fair chance to get the merits of our position before the country, and every fair-minded Member of the Senate knows that to be true. So we do not propose to shackle ourselves, under the specious plea that is made, and preclude ourselves from utilizing the few opportunities made available to us.

Complaint is made about this so-called slow and tedious process, but by this process we propose to endeavor to get before the people the larger issue of importance of preserving the power of the several States to control their elections, rather than to endanger the rights of all the people by the creation of machinery for Federal control of elections from Washington.

That is why I object to the unanimous-consent request which has been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia objects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection so that I may make a brief observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation, also.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Georgia has objected, and that is his position, I shall withdraw my request, because I feel that no further debate is necessary. I should like to make a brief statement regarding the pending matter, but I shall not do so if the Senator is going to object, if that is his position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement requested a moment ago has been objected to, while I agree that a matter of judgment is involved, I believe that the time has arrived when we should attempt to limit the time on the motion to have the Senate take up the bill.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have profound admiration, that he has a perfect right, as does each and every other Senator, to talk about the merits of the matter or to discuss objections to the proposed legislation; but, Mr. President, I submit to all Members of the Senate that it can be done under the debate on the subject matter itself, and my opinion is that that is where it should be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska state how much time he would be willing to give us to discuss the merits?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please.

The concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate voting is required for the adoption of a cloture petition. I submit to the Members of this body that if two-thirds of the Senators voting feel that this proposed legislation is of such importance that it should be taken up, then we should abide by such two-thirds vote, and should proceed to discuss the merits of the bill. In such case, every right a Senator now has in connection with the motion will be available to him in connection with the bill itself, so far as concerns debating the merits of the measure and debating the procedure connected therewith.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, as to the emergency which has been referred to, I agree with the Senator from Georgia that I myself would not say that the point as to whether this particular piece of legislation is an emergency is not a debatable one. However, we are now in the midst of an emergency session of the Congress. We have been asked by the President of the United States to take up the civil-rights legislation as a part of the second category of legislation which should be passed. Because of that fact, I think it behooves us to bring up, as I stated at the beginning of the session, the only piece of proposed legislation I know of that is ready for consideration, which is the bill that is requested to be enacted on the subject of the poll tax.

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

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment, please.

Mr. President, furthermore, I feel that if we are to have before us for consideration any other proposed legislation, inasmuch as a cloture petition could not be voted upon before Wednesday, under the rule, by that time certainly there will be other proposed legislation for us to consider. If two-thirds of the Senators present vote to adopt a cloture petition, we would be ready to discuss the proposed legislation to which it relates. If a two-thirds vote is not obtainable, then we could proceed to the consideration of any other proposed legislation which might come before us, under the recommendations of a committee.

I hope the Senator from Georgia will feel that I am doing this in justice and in fair play, under the sole theory that if there is anything new about the subject, if there is any evidence on which a case can be made for or against this particular piece of proposed legislation, the time to do so is in connection with the debate on the subject matter involved, and not in connection with a motion, the pendency of which prevents the subject matter itself from being considered and terminated one way or the other, either at this session or any other session of the Senate of the United States.

It is in that spirit and in that light only that I now send to the desk a cloture petition which I feel meets all the requirements of the rules. I submit the petition, and ask that it be read, and that the proper procedure be had relative to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the Presiding Officer is required immediately to lay the cloture petition before the Senate. Without objection, it will be read by the clerk, instead of by the Chair.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1948.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the pending measure, namely, the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national offices:

1. KENNETH S. WHERRY.
2. ROBERT A. TAFT.
3. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
4. JOE MCCARTHY.
5. RALPH E. FLANDERS.
6. I. M. IVES.
7. HOMER FERGUSON.
8. GUY CORDON.
9. CLYDE M. REED.
10. W. E. JENNER.
11. ARTHUR CAPPER.
12. H. ALEXANDER SMITH.
13. B. B. HICKENLOOPER.
14. H. C. LODGE, Jr.
15. JAMES P. KEM.
16. WAYNE MORSE.
17. EDWARD MARTIN.
18. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.
19. CLAUDE PEPPER.
20. ALBEN W. BARKLEY.
21. J. HOWARD MCGRATH.
22. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Mr. WHERRY. I now yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I decline to yield at the present time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Georgia will yield to me for a moment. I previously tried to obtain the floor, when I requested the Senator from Nebraska to grant me the courtesy of yielding to me for a moment. But that courtesy was not accorded me by the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Florida without jeopardizing my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that the distinguished acting majority leader has seen fit to take a position which in effect operates to shut off one point of view which has not had so much as a moment's consideration on this floor. I do not mean the point of view of only one Senator, but I mean the point of view of a number of Senators representing various States which once had a poll tax requirement but which, in their sound judgment, have since terminated it as a prerequisite for their elections.

Mr. President, the distinguished acting majority leader may think he has been through the mill in this connection, but I wish to state that one does not have to be a Member of Congress to go through the battle on this question. At one time when I was a member of the Florida Legislature, this issue was a heated and controversial one on which numbers of our best citizens were alined, some on one side and some on the other. It was debated for days. It was decided with nothing like unanimity.

It happens that the junior Senator from Florida was one of those who supported the abolition of the poll tax, and successfully voted for abolition of the poll tax. Under the constitutional requirements of our State it was a legislative matter resting solely in the discretion of the legislature as to whether a poll tax should exist and, if it existed, whether it should be a prerequisite for voting.

Therefore, Mr. President, I speak from the point of view of one who comes from a State which has abolished the poll tax, after having had it for many years; and I also speak from the point of view of one who personally has advocated and voted for the repeal of the poll tax as a qualification for voting in the elections of his particular State.

Mr. President, I think it is unseemly indeed for a group of States, represented by a number of legislators, to preclude other Senators from presenting here, an explanation and statement of our position, which necessarily differs from that of other Senators, in their respective States, because as we view the matter, a question of fundamental constitutional law is involved, and one which we cannot ignore, and beyond that, questions of far-reaching policy are involved which, as we think may not be ignored, not solely from the standpoint of properly serving our own people and our own States, but of properly serving all the people of all the 48 States of the Union.

I regret exceedingly that the acting majority leader has taken such an arbitrary position, and I call to his attention and to the attention of numerous of my friends on the other side of the Chamber, and on this side likewise, who I notice signed the petition for cloture, that I sat here and listened, not merely for one day, but for days on end, to learned statements and erudite speeches by certain Members of this Congress, and I generally enjoyed those statements. In most particulars I thought they were justified in consuming the length of time that they consumed. I remember, if he will give me his attention a moment, the learned speech made by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] on the portal-to-portal question. I thought it was an excellent speech, and exhaustive. It went into every point which he thought and which I could think of that the Supreme Court might raise in looking at that legislation, which had as its origin and for its necessity a ruling of the Supreme Court. I shall not attempt to say how many hours the argument of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri consumed, but my recollection is it took five calendar days of the Senate's time. I did not think the time was wasted, and I did not get up and go out, leaving him to talk to empty benches. I did not decline to listen to his position. No one thought of trying to shut him off. To the contrary, we felt he was honoring us by giving a clear and exhaustive exposition of a matter which he thought was of great importance. Frankly, I agreed with him in his feeling that it was of importance.

I see another Senator over there, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to whom I listened hours on end—I would say probably 40 hours—in the 1947 session, on the subject of labor-industry relations. Nobody tried to shut him off. Nobody tried to preclude him from expressing his convictions which he thought were sound from the standpoint, I am sure, of serving not only the industry of his State, but the industry of the Nation. Whether I agreed with his convictions or not, I sat here and listened to them and gave him the courtesy of a chance to express himself.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, to whom I shall yield in a minute, that I think the statement I was proposing to make on this subject, after I had given it long study and had searched my conscience, as well as the records and the history of our Nation in this matter, should be made before a decision is reached as to whether this particular bill shall come up. My proposed statement goes, in the main, to the question of whether or not the subject matter should be dealt with under a statute, by way of the proposed bill, or under a constitutional amendment, as was so learnedly and ably suggested here the other day by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I think the time to make that decision, certainly a proper time, would be before the vote to take up the particuluar measure here offered, which is nothing but a bill which, if enacted, becomes a statute.

I want to say without rancor and without resentment that I am at a loss to understand the change in attitude of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, here serving as acting majority floor leader, because I have always thought he was rather generous in his attitude toward other Senators in his desire to see that their viewpoint was given fair expression. I do not believe by searching the RECORD in the nearly 2 years I have been here that the distinguished Senator can point to any one time when I have occupied the floor of the Senate in excess of 30 or 40 minutes, and those occasions have been very few. So it seems to me that ample time should be afforded, recognizing the fact that there are three groups on this side, one coming from poll-tax States, which are still laboring under the poll-tax requirement; the second coming from poll-tax States which are now moving to remove that requirement. I note that the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], coming from one of those States, is here prepared to state the viewpoint of those States, and of the Senators who come from those States. Then there is the third group, and it happens in my case peculiarly, that, as to the junior Senator from Florida, I think he is entitled to the courtesy of having a chance to express his position, which by many of his people may be questioned or misunderstood because they may think it differs from the position he took in the legislative halls at Tallahassee, whereas it does not differ, because of the vastly different issue prevailing here.

I must oppose this bill. I shall gladly support, not only here on the floor, but by my influence, for whatever it may be worth, for its adoption in my State, the submission of a constitutional amendment dealing with the matter. I must say, if I may be allowed one more minute before I sit down, that I am disappointed that the distinguished acting majority leader has not seen fit to grant us the courtesy of a hearing, when three times here on the floor before he submitted the cloture petition I asked for the courtesy of the chance to be heard and to explain a position which I think is worth explaining, and to have a chance to make my statement here on the floor of the Senate in my own time, but not at too great length. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 30 seconds?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield under the same understanding, to a brief statement by the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the same circumstances, the Senator from Georgia yields to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. The argument made by the distinguished Senator from Florida,

which I think is very fair and very honorable, certainly could be made against a cloture petition filed against the subject matter of the poll tax, and I certainly would agree with him, and I would be the last man in the Senate to make a motion to cut off debate on the subject matter before the United States Senate. But this cloture petition is filed only on the motion to take up, that is all. It is in a different category from the St. Lawrence seaway. In that case the question was on a motion to reconsider and to recommit. It is in a different category from the portal-to-portal legislation, in connection with which the information the distinguished Senator brought to the Senate proved very valuable, and on which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] delivered an illuminating speech.

I simply want to say—and I hope the Senator will not lose faith in the acting majority leader—that I do think it is a matter of judgment as to whether or not there has been sufficient time on the motion. I think there has been, but I would be the last man in the Senate to offer a cloture petition on the subject matter if I thought ample time had not been given for debate. I assure the distinguished Senator that if two-thirds of the Senate vote to sustain the cloture petition, ample time will be given to the distinguished Senator for the presentation of his argument.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield on the same terms?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, on the same terms.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to point out one other thing, that the Senator will have all day today, he will have all day tomorrow, and if cloture should be voted, he will have another hour after that to make all the remarks he wants to make on the motion to take up the poll-tax measure, without even debating the merits of the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. For a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Only for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the able Senator from Georgia whether he proposes to address himself to the parliamentary situation now existing since the filing of the petition, and whether he thinks it would be effective to curtail the debate, even if it were adopted by two-thirds. Does the Senator propose to address himself to that parliamentary question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I intend to address myself to the parliamentary situation, after I have made a motion.

Mr. President, I desire to lodge a point of order against what purports to be a cloture petition. Before I do so, I desire to move the yeas and nays on the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 29.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks for the yeas and nays on the motion to take up House bill 29. Is there a sufficient second?

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the adoption of the motion for the yeas and nays in any way affect the right on the petition which has been filed before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks not, although it does affect the right of the mover of the motion to withdraw it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Chair mean the motion to take up the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair rules, then, that the granting of the yeas and nays in no way affects the parliamentary situation, so far as the petition is concerned?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the Chair understands and can anticipate the situation, that is the Chair's view. The Chair cannot know what the Senator from Georgia has in mind. The Senator from Georgia has asked for the yeas and nays. There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the motion now pending before the Senate is the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill, which has been made by the acting majority leader. The Senator from Florida would like to propound an inquiry as to whether the effect of an order for the yeas and nays would be that the motion would not be withdrawn except by unanimous consent, on the pending measure before the Senate.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Florida, for example, should have ready to offer in the Senate an amendment to the aircraft bill, which is Senate bill 2644, the pending measure, a bill, I believe, which is being sponsored by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]—if the Senator from Florida wished to offer an anti-poll-tax amendment as an amendment to the pending measure, I should like to know whether, if the motion made by the acting majority leader should be withdrawn, such a proposed amendment to the pending measure would be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair has declared the yeas and nays in order, so the question is entirely moot.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is moot, but the Chair will answer it. Except as the pending motion submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is withdrawn. But it cannot be withdrawn now in view of the order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Chair announced the order for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to submit a point of order against this attempt to apply cloture to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill. This question has been discussed in the Senate for a number of years, and all parliamentarians have universally held that a cloture petition would not lie against a motion to take up a bill. The cloture petition now presented undertakes by its terms to avoid this ruling by calling the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill a measure. Calling the motion a measure does not make it so. It is a confession of the weakness of the position of those who are undertaking to file the petition. They undertake to confuse the issue by labeling as a measure the motion to proceed to the consideration of the poll-tax bill. But the statement in the cloture petition does not alter the rules or the precedents of the Senate. The rule which applies in this case, Mr. President, is rule XXII of the Senate, paragraph 2, from which I read:

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure—

The whole crux of the matter is found in those two words "pending measure"—

> is presented to the Senate, The Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate—

And then the rule proceeds to outline the procedure which follows in the case of a cloture petition being filed upon a pending measure.

Mr. President, it has always been universally conceded that a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill was not a pending measure. Certainly it could not be a pending measure. A pending measure means substantive legislation, not any of the various collateral motions used as a means of operating the parliamentary machinery of the Senate.

I desire to point out a precedent in this matter, which is not direct, but which is certainly persuasive to the correctness of the point of order before the Senate. When the so-called FEPC bill was before the Senate in 1946 we had practically the same parliamentary situation, except that we were discussing a motion to correct the Journal instead of a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. Those who sought to bring the debate to a close on that matter admitted that a cloture petition did not lie as against a simple motion of the Senate. It was undertaken to bring the bill to a vote by filing a cloture petition to the bill, although it was not before the Senate at the time. The Chair properly ruled that the bill was not before the Senate, and therefore that a cloture petition did not lie.

The rules of the Senate may be very vexing to us at times. All of us are wearied by long-drawn-out debate. We have had no long-drawn-out debate in this instance. The subject was presented to the Senate only on last Thursday. Speeches have been made relating to the economic condition of the country and to the European situation, and the only Senators who have discussed the merits of the question are those whom you are now seeking to gag with this cloture petition. The opponents of this bill have discussed only the issues involved in the

proposed legislation, and half the time has been consumed by other Senators on other matters. The Rules of the Senate may be irksome at times, but they were not written to enable a majority of Senators to gag the minority on the floor until the minority have had every opportunity to present their case—oftimes the minority of today becomes the majority of tomorrow. The majority is not always right. The rules of the Senate have never contemplated precipitate action before Senators have full opportunity to express themselves.

Every rule of the Senate was written with a view to keeping the Senate a great deliberative body. There is no greater bulwark of constitutional government than is freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States. The founding fathers planned wisely, and those who sat in the first session of the Senate and wrote the rules wisely conceived of a time when there would be good reasons for men who were in the minority to talk until the voice of reason and justice could be heard. Our institutions of free government will be endangered if we ever permit minority groups and representatives of special privilege to force through legislation without allowing such adequate debate that the people of the Nation may be fully apprised of the nature and implications of the pending issue. It was never intended, under Senate rules, to deal lightly with the question of free debate in the Senate. It was never intended that a cloture petition should be applied to a mere motion in the Senate. If that were the case, certainly the authors of this rule would not have so carefully written the words "pending measure." A pending measure certainly cannot be a motion to proceed to consideration of a bill. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that any Senator has contended that a cloture petition would lie as against a motion to proceed. I know of the pressures to which the Chair might be subjected in making a ruling. For my part, I have implicit confidence in the sense of fairness and justice of the Chair and that he will adhere to the precedents of the Senate.

I submit the point of order, with full confidence of being sustained by the Chair, that a cloture petition would not lie at the present time. It is admitted, even in the efforts which have been made in this Congress to amend the rules to make a cloture petition apply to a motion, that it does not lie at the present time as the rules are now written.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On the question of what is the pending measure, if this motion were agreed to, would there be any change in the law relating to legislative action? On the other hand, if the motion were rejected, would there be any change?

Mr. RUSSELL. A pending measure is a bill or other piece of legislation before the Senate. A mere motion to consider it cannot have the effect of law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Whether the motion be adopted or rejected, it cannot have any effect whatever.

Mr. RUSSELL. Rule XXII is very clear, Mr. President. I am willing to submit my case to the Chair on that point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia makes a point of order against the cloture petition.

The Chair would like to state that the subject is not new to him; it has been a matter of study for many years; and the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules, I should like to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will hear the Senator from California briefly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise merely so that the RECORD at least will be reasonably complete, and show that there is another point of view in this matter of rule XXII.

If we assume that the point raised by the Senator from Georgia is sound, and if we assume that some of the more recent precedents, which as yet have not been passed upon by the Senate itself, are correct, then I submit to the Senate that rule XXII is absolutely meaningless and there is no protection in the Senate of the United States at all. In each and every case, in order to circumvent rule XXII, a Senator need only conduct a filibuster against the motion to take up a bill, and, as we all know, a bill cannot be taken up unless a motion is made to take it up, except by unanimous consent. As a result, rule XXII would be absolutely meaningless, under those conditions.

I submit, Mr. President, that under the interpretation which appears in Webster's New International Dictionary the word "measure" means, according to subsection 11:

> A step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end.

Certainly a motion fits into that category.

I call attention to the very able statement made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in his individual views on the amendments which had been offered to the cloture rule submitted by a number of Senators, including the junior Senator from California, at the time when the amendments to rules suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts were favorably reported to the Senate.

In the original debates in the Senate on rule XXII it seemed clear that at least the Senators who were here at that time thought that by a two-thirds vote they did have a means of controlling unlimited debate, and I submit, Mr. President, that if that contention is not followed, the Senate has surrendered into the hands of a single Senator the power to obstruct the legislative processes of government. That is more power than the Constitution gives to the President of the United States in the use of his veto, because a two-thirds vote of each House of the Congress can override a Presidential veto.

If this contention is allowed to stand without correction by the Senate, one Senator or two Senators, or a small handful of Senators, can completely upset the orderly processes of representative government.

The Senate was confronted by a filibuster at the close of the last session of the Congress, when two Members of this body were able to obstruct for a time the entire legislative process, among other business to block the Selective Service Act, which was vitally necessary to the national defense of this Nation. I said then, and I repeat today, that is too much power for any responsible person to want, and too much power for any irresponsible person to have.

Mr. President, I am quite frank to admit that there is a legitimate argument which can be made to sustain the contention that cloture should not apply by a mere majority vote. I have somewhat changed my views on that subject. I offered an amendment to the rule which would have permitted cloture to be applied by a majority vote of the entire membership of the Senate. I am willing to admit that there is certainly an honest difference of opinion on that score, and perhaps it would not be wise to go that far in amending the rules. But I say that if the contention made, that cloture does not apply to a motion, is allowed to stand, we actually have no rule XXII, and the Senate has no protection in conducting its business in an orderly fashion. For that reason I hope that the decision will be made applying cloture under the circumstances confronting us today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to intrude upon the time of the President of the Senate or impose my views upon him, except very briefly. I had to deal with these problems on two or three former occasions when I was majority leader, when efforts were made to secure consideration of anti-poll-tax and similar legislation. I have had to combat the effort to delay consideration by every means I thought within my power.

My attitude on the anti-poll-tax legislation is well known. My attitude on antilynching legislation is well known. I have made my views known here in the Senate and in speeches which I have made during much of my life. Nearly a generation ago the Legislature of Kentucky submitted to the people an amendment to our State constitution seeking to impose the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as indicating the right of a voter to cast his vote. I opposed that amendment to our State constitution, and the people overwhelmingly defeated it, and it is not in our fundamental law.

I had intended to call the attention of the Chair to the various definitions referred to by the Senator from California in regard to the meaning of the word "measure." There are many meanings of that word. A condition may exist requiring a remedy of some sort, whether legislative or otherwise, and it is a common thing to say that "steps ought to be taken" or "measures ought to be taken" to correct the condition, whatever it may be. I do not think there has been in the Senate any legal definition as to what a "measure" is, but colloquially we have been in the habit of referring to a bill as a measure, or to a resolution as a

measure; but when a bill or resolution is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, it is no longer a measure, it is an act. So that the definition of "measure" would not apply in that case.

I have not any doubt that when the Senate adopted the rule XXII it intended to make it possible for the Senate to bring to a termination debate upon any matter before it. If it be true that a measure is a step, among other steps, in a progressive course to bring about the consummation of some action, certainly a motion would be a measure within that sense. A motion to reconsider the vote by which a bill had passed would likewise be a measure within that sense.

I am merely urging that the Chair give consideration, if he has not done so, to that phase of the definition of "measure" in reaching his conclusion as to the validity of the petition which has been filed in order that we may bring this matter to a conclusion.

I have no desire to labor the point. I do believe that when the Senate adopted this rule it adopted it with the view and the intention and the conviction that it could bring any matter to a conclusion by the adoption of cloture. Since it was adopted, devices have been discovered and utilized by which the effectiveness of the rule is nullified, and I agree with the Senator from California—and I have said so heretofore when we were in the majority and when I was the majority leader—that the object of the rule is to bring to a conclusion a discussion upon a pending matter, and if we cannot bring it to a conclusion upon the preliminary motions which may be regarded as measures toward that end, then the effectiveness of the rule is completely destroyed, and the object of those who wrote it and adopted it has been completely defeated.

The object of all legislation is to secure action. The object of all rules is to bring about legislation within legislative bodies, and in any parliamentary assembly the object of rules is to facilitate the transaction of business and not unduly to obstruct it.

Having in mind the obvious intention of the framers of this rule and of the Senate when it adopted it, and the definition which is applicable, in my judgment, it seems to me that it is a proper procedure to file the petition at this particular time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from California mentioned the minority views which I filed on Senate Resolution No. 25 to amend the Rules of the Senate with respect to cloture. I should like to invite the attention of the Chair to a very significant fact in connection with that resolution. It was submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts on January 6, 1946, was considered in the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration for more than 2 months, and finally the resolution, as amended, to change rule XXII, which now reads that cloture may be imposed upon any pending measure, was reported, and as reported the words "motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business" were added to it.

It was the deliberate judgment of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, after careful study, that at the present time the Rules of the Senate do not permit a cloture petition to be filed either upon a motion to approve or amend the Journal or a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. If the Chair were to reverse that position he would go directly contrary to the action taken by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which to my mind would be parliamentary hijacking, in which neither the Chair nor the Senate should indulge.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to submit only a brief observation upon this matter. The decision which the Chair is about to make is of grievous import to the country and possibly to the world. I am aware that the precedents favor the point of order made by the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in that decisions of previous presiding officers in the chair on other occasions sustain the point of order. However, Mr. President, every presiding officer, if I may say so, stands upon his own authority. He exercises his own power. He has the authority to make a decision in accordance with the rule, its language, and intent, which the distinguished presiding officer himself thinks is right and proper in course of his duty.

Mr. President, the language of rule XXII, of course, contains the words "pending measure." The pertinent portion of the language of the rule is:

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate—

But, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the word "measure" was used synonymously with the word "matter." Any pending matter; any pending question; any pending measure; whichever one may happen to choose to use. Those who in 1917 were trying to correct the error that permitted a filibuster against the arming of merchant ships upon the eve of World War I, as requested by President Wilson, were not making merely a futile gesture that would leave a door wide enough for any filibuster to pass through. That group of Senators, in my humble judgment, as has been better said by others, intended to give two-thirds of the Senate the power to determine what is the pending business in the Senate, and when debate shall be brought to a close upon any pending question.

Mr. President, the first time cloture was applied was on the treaty of peace with Germany at the end of World War I. The second time it was applied was in respect of the adherence of this country to the World Court in 1927. This is the poll-tax measure today. It might have been the Marshall plan a month or two ago. It may be a peace treaty in this session or the next session of Congress. It may mean selective service. It may mean any measure, Mr. President, which goes to the power of the Government of the United States to act; and to say that four-fifths or five-sixths or nine-tenths of the Senate cannot determine what its calendar of business shall be, and cannot determine when debate shall be brought to a close is to give a minority the power to throttle and to strangle the legislative power, which means the functioning of the Government of the United States. No minority has the right to such power.

Today, so far as the rules are concerned, the question presents itself to the able Presiding Officer as to how he should rule upon this question, and he has the same prerogative that courts have and exercise to reverse their decisions when they become convinced that they are not correct or proper. I believe if the Chair had this question anew to decide, that there would be no question but that the Chair would decide that two-thirds of the Senate may determine what the Senate's business is, and two-thirds of the Senate may bring debate to a close.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I be permitted to make one very brief statement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, dire pictures have been painted here, as in times past, as to the evils of unlimited discussion in the Senate of the United States. But it is a historic fact, Mr. President, that though there have been innumerable filibusters in this body—so designated by those who are on the majority side of the issue—and though there have been any number of occasions when we have all grown impatient on account of long speeches, Senators of the United States have so well recognized their responsibility in this body that no man can point to a really emergent piece of legislation necessary to the welfare of all the people of the country that has been defeated by what is called a filibuster. We are aware of our responsibilities here and as keenly alive to them as is any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, it is common custom in some quarters to refer to the Senators from the Southern States as "Claghorns," but I say that the Members of this body from the South, the present speaker excepted, measure up in patriotism and in ability to those from any other section of the land. We are aware of our responsibilities as Senators. But we do not propose to be kicked about as a political football in a political year if we can help it. I repeat that there has never been an important, a meritorious, an emergent piece of legislation in all the history of the Senate, with its unlimited debate, that has been killed by a filibuster. And over the years, though many hours have been sweated out here in night sessions, all necessary legislation has been enacted. This is neither an emergent or a necessary bill. The subject is shot through and through with politics and hypocrisy.

The rules of the Senate suffice when the majority is right, and when the minority has the courage of their conviction and know they are right, the rules of the Senate are broad enough to throw a protecting mantle about the minority until they have an opportunity to be heard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair begs the indulgence of the Senate to make a statement in connection with the ruling. The Chair is entirely conscious of the importance of the

decision about to be rendered, as just indicated by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. The Chair wishes to state at the outset that he is deeply conscious of the importance of preserving the integrity of congressional procedures, which, in the Chair's judgment, transcends at this critical hour in the world's history any possible transient advantages which might come from ruling of a different character.

The Chair is also conscious of a very great personal embarrassment and difficulty in rendering the decision because of his well-known prejudice in respect to the basic issues involved. He favors the anti-poll-tax legislation. He believes that debate should come to an end after a reasonable period, and he emphatically agrees that the Senate should be in ultimate control of its own destiny.

In making the ruling which the Chair will shortly announce, he hopes that it may be entirely plain that he is not only putting aside all his own personal prejudices and predilections, but that he is also not undertaking, even by indirect inference, to rule upon the merits of the pending measure. He is dealing solely with what he considers to be his responsibility under oath, as an officer of the Senate, required to deal with the Senate on the basis of his best judgment and honest reflection of what the Senate rules require.

The Chair would like to make this very brief preliminary historical observation:

The cloture rule was adopted on March 3, 1917, by an overwhelming vote of 76 yeas and 3 nays, indicating the overwhelming belief of the Senate at that time in the necessity for some adequate control by the Senate, in the final analysis, of its own operations. The term used in the rule to define the matter upon which a cloture motion may be presented is "pending measure." From the debate on the question of the adoption of the rule it would clearly appear to the Chair that it was a bill, a specific act, which was contemplated to be the "pending measure."

The then Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Boies Penrose, preliminary to making an inquiry in connection with the resolution, said:

> The resolution provides a method of cloture for closing debate, and provides that the pending bill shall be the unfinished business of the Senate to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

No reference appears anywhere in the debate that it was the intention or purpose to bring within the scope of the rule a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

In November 1919, while the treaty of peace with Germany was under consideration, the then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Hitchcock, presented a cloture motion on the reservations proposed to the treaty by the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, at that time chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. A discussion immediately arose as to whether the motion was in order, and what constituted the pending measure. The then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, in the course of the debate, made the point of order that the pending measure was the treaty itself, and not the reservations, a point of order which was sustained by the President pro tempore, Senator Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa. An appeal from the ruling was laid on the table by a vote of 44 to 36.

There has been no direct ruling upon the specific question whether a motion to take up a bill is subject to cloture. It has been recognized and understood that such is not the case, on the ground that a motion cannot reasonably be construed to be a pending measure within the meaning of the cloture rule. This is evidenced by the fact that numerous resolutions have been submitted from time to time having for their purpose an amendment of the rule so as to give a privileged status to a cloture motion, and expressly making its presentation in order at any time upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business.

As Members of the Senate are aware, there is now pending on the Senate Calendar a resolution, Senate Resolution 25, favorably reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is designed to bring about such an amendment of the rule.

The Senate is familiar with the fact that the precedents of the Senate clearly indicate that a motion to approve the Journal cannot be brought within the jurisdiction of cloture action, and that conclusion has been very widely and generally accepted by all Senators with whom the Presiding Officer has ever conversed on this subject.

It seems to the President pro tempore that we come down to a very simple question, which does not require consultation with Webster's dictionary in order to know the answer. The rule provides that—

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate—

And so forth. What is the "pending measure" at this moment? The pending measure is Senate bill 2644, a bill to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military services, and for other purposes. What is the purpose of the motion made by the able Senator from Nebraska, to which it is now being attempted to attach cloture? It is to create a new "pending measure." That is exactly the objective which the pending motion has in view. In the view of the Chair, in a reasonable interpretation of the English language the Chair is unable to believe otherwise than that the "pending measure" at this moment in the forum of the Senate is Senate bill 2644. It is not the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

The Chair notes in passing that, as the cloture petition was originally drawn, it read:

> To bring to a close the debate upon the pending motion—

Before being submitted, it was interlined to read:

> To close debate upon the pending measure, namely, the motion—

The President pro tempore finds it necessary, in conclusion, before announcing his decision, to state again that he is not passing upon the merits of the poll-tax issue, nor is he passing upon the desirability of a much stronger cloture rule in determining this point of order. The President pro tempore is not entitled to consult his own predilections or his own convictions in the use of this authority, however. He must act in his capacity as an officer of the Senate under oath to enforce its rules as he finds them to exist, whether he likes them or not, and whether he agrees with them or not. Of all the precedents necessary to preserve, this is the most important of all. Otherwise the preservation of any minority rights for any minority at any time would become impossible.

The President pro tempore is a sworn agent of the law as he finds the law to be. Only the Senate has the right to change the law. The President pro tempore feels that he is entitled particularly to underscore this axiom in the present instance, because the present circumstances themselves bring it into such bold and sharp relief.

In his capacity as a Senator, the President pro tempore favors the passage of the anti-poll-tax measure now. He has similarly voted upon numerous previous occasions. In his capacity as a Senator the President pro tempore believes that the rules of the Senate should permit cloture upon the pending motion to take up the anti-poll-tax measure; but in his capacity as President pro tempore the senior Senator from Michigan is bound to recognize what he believes to be the clear mandate of the Senate rules and the Senate precedents; namely, that no such authority presently exists.

The President pro tempore fully recognizes the implications of the resultant situation, as stated so eloquently by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. There is nothing new about those implications. They have been perfectly apparent to students of the Senate rules for many years. They mean that, in the final analysis, the Senate has no effective cloture rule at all. They mean that a small but determined minority can always prevent cloture, under the existing rules. They mean that a very few Senators have it in their power to prevent Senate action on anything. The Chair does not presume to pass upon what Senators may believe to be their justification for the use of such a power; he challenges no man's motives; he simply states the fact and what he believes to be the result of the fact.

The fact is that the existing Senate rules regarding cloture do not provide conclusive cloture. They still leave the Senate, rightly or wrongly, at the mercy of unlimited debate ad infinitum. The Chair repeats that this is no new discovery on his part. He repeats it has been frankly conceded by the Rules Committee of the Senate itself. It was conceded when this committee reported, on March 24, 1947—more than 1 year ago—Senate Resolution 25, which seeks to make the existing Senate cloture rule succeed in its purported power to permit two-thirds of the Senate to curb unlimited debate. That resolution has been on the Senate Calendar for 16 months. It has not been adopted. It is intended to prevent the precise purpose sought by

the pending point of order. Its presence on the Senate Calendar, by order of the Rules Committee, is, in the opinion of the Chair, complete proof that the Senate Rules Committee admits the validity of the pending point of order. The President pro tempore cannot be expected to cure, by an arbitrary ruling, the existing fatal defect in the cloture rule which the Senate itself has been invited, but has thus far declined, to cure.

It is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair in his capacity as senior Senator from Michigan that the Senate should adopt Senate Resolution 25, which makes the existing cloture rule mean what it purports to say, namely that, in extreme circumstances, two-thirds of the Senate can control the Senate's destiny. The Senate should not be impotent in emergency. If the Senate wishes to cure this impotence it has the authority, the power, and the means to do so. The President pro tempore of the Senate does not have the authority, the power, or the means to do so except as he arbitrarily takes the law into his own hands. This he declines to do in violation of his oath. If he did so, he would feel that what might be deemed temporary advantage by some could become a precedent which ultimately, in subsequent practice, would rightly be condemned by all.

The point of order is sustained. In making the ruling, the Chair recognizes the right of the Senate to make and interpret its own rules. The Senate has the right of appeal from the decision of the Chair. The Chair invites the Senate to exercise this right if it desires, even though the effort confronts much the same difficulties as does the present cloture petition.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I did not yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would appreciate it if the Senator from Virginia would permit the appeal to be made, so as to complete this particular procedure, with the understanding—if it is agreeable to the Senator from Ohio—that the Senator from Virginia shall be permitted to proceed before the vote is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly. Of course, the appeal is subject to debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The appeal is subject to debate.

Mr. TAFT. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Virginia——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield, for the purpose of permitting me to appeal from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes, if I may have unanimous consent that in yielding to permit the Senator's appeal to be made, for later consideration, I shall not lose any of my privileges of the floor, including the right to discuss the ruling and the larger implications of what we are considering. If such consent is granted, I yield under those circumstances.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to that effect. While I am asking it, I would also ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for not more than 2 minutes in making a very brief explanation of the purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair chiefly, of course, because it leaves the Senate in an almost impossible situation. A motion to take up is subject to debate and against it under the Chair's decision, a cloture petition cannot lie. Consequently there is no way by which this situation can be changed, except by physical exhaustion, by keeping the Senate in session day in and day out, which I hope will not be necessary, although we shall have to get to it next year unless this proposed change is made.

I appreciate the view of the President pro tempore as to what the word "measure" means—which, after all, is a very narrow question, and certainly is open to debate. I further appreciate the Chair's good faith in making the ruling. However, it is a question on which the Senate has never spoken and I believe the Senate should determine that question before forcing us into a position of having a filibuster on an attempt to change the rule, which perhaps would be even a more difficult matter, because every Senator interested in stopping any bill at all would oppose an attempt to change the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has appealed from the decision of the Chair. Therefore, the pending question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the decision of the Senate?

The Chair would like to add that he welcomes the appeal, because, as he indicated in his ruling, he feels that this is a matter on which the Senate itself must speak.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do so, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I propound the following inquiry: If a motion is made to lay the appeal on the table, is that motion subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No motion to table is ever subject to debate.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

If the motion to table the appeal is agreed to, then, of course, the result is to sustain the present occupant of the chair in his decision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the appeal is sustained, the Chair is overruled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the question: If the appeal is sustained, is the decision of the Chair on the point of order overruled?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The decision of the Chair is overruled, under those circumstances; and the cloture petition is valid, if the Chair is overruled on this appeal.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, would it be mandatory, 1 hour after the Senate convenes on Wednesday, that the cloture petition be voted upon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the Chair restate the ruling just made. I am sure several Members of the Senate did not clearly understand it. Certainly I did not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair stated that if the appeal from the Chair's decision is sustained, the Chair is overruled, and the petition becomes valid, and the cloture procedure provided in the rule will proceed according to the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The appeal entered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio is debatable; is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is debatable.

Mr. RUSSELL. And if the appeal should be tabled, as indicated by the Senator from Nebraska, that would mean that the ruling of the Chair had been sustained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And failure to lay the appeal on the table would in no wise preclude any Member of the Senate from debating the appeal made by the Senator from Ohio would it?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. Under the ruling which the Chair has just made, would the Chair make the same ruling as to a cloture petition to close debate on the appeal by the Senator from Ohio from the decision of the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. TAFT. If a cloture petition is filed on the appeal by the Senator from Ohio from the decision of the Chair, will such cloture petition lie, under the rules of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think so, because the same point would be involved as was involved in the original ruling.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan will state the inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the ruling of the Chair that unlimited debate may be had on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, and that a petition for cloture to close such debate cannot be considered or voted on?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct as the Chair understands the situation.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Am I correct in understanding that I can yield without losing the floor and without losing my rights?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can yield without losing the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I confess myself puzzled as to where we are now. In reading rule XX, I note that it says:

every appeal therefrom—

That is, from a decision of the Chair—

shall be decided at once, and without debate.

How does it come that we are not deciding at once and without debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The main appeal, which is the initial appeal made by the Senator from Ohio, is debatable. Any point of order secondary to that appeal is not debatable.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would the Chair mind referring the Senator from Vermont to the rule which gives that permission or states that condition?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair refers the Senator to rule XX, which he may read to himself, and be advised.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield under the same circumstances and assurances?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Under the same circumstances and assurances, I yield for a question, but I hope it will be brief.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who has studied this matter, a little bit superficially, perhaps, in the past 3 years, and as one who has listened to the eloquent statement by the President pro tempore of his views as to the meaning of the term "pending measure," I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia a question. I personally shall vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair if the appeal comes to a vote. My question to the Senator from Virginia is, In view of the ruling by the President pro tempore, and in view of the primary need of the Senate, itself, to be able to make rule XXII effective, would the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia object to a unanimous-consent request to take up Calendar No. 85, Senate Resolution 25, at the present time?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I asked the Senator from Virginia the question, in the first instance.

Mr. EASTLAND. Whether the Senator from Virginia objects or not, I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi objects. Whether the Senator from Virginia objects is now a moot question.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator from Mississippi has already objected, so any answer on my part would be purely a moot proceeding.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am sorry; I cannot yield any further. I have been trying to start for nearly an hour, and I should like to get to the debate of the pending subject today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to commend the ruling of the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate as being both correct and courageous. It was correct because it followed the plain meaning of the English language in the Senate rule relating to cloture. It was correct because it followed established decisions by previous presiding officers on the same point. It was correct because it followed the decisions of the Rules Committee of the Senate, who so recently have said that cloture cannot be invoked on a motion, and have suggested that the rule be so changed that in the future such action may be taken. The ruling was courageous because the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] made an impassioned plea to the Presiding Officer, though admitting that previous decisions had been that cloture could not be applied to a motion. He said he was under the impression that the Presiding Officer felt a proper interpretation of the rule would require him to rule against the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, but he appealed to the Presiding Officer to give power to the majority here, inferring that the sentiments of the Presiding Officer were in line with what the majority wanted to do. I naturally assume, therefore, Mr. President, that if the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, who signed the cloture petition, should succeed in getting the Congress to pass an anti-poll-tax bill, he would make the same kind of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, on every occasion when the question has been before it, has consistently ruled that the Congress has no legal and constitutional right and power to act.

Mr. President, special sessions of the Congress are ordinarily called for the consideration of a national emergency and ordinarily limit their action to matters falling within that general category. But the first legislation proposed for consideration at this special session has been a bill to repeal the poll tax in seven States in which that qualification of voters is written into the respective State constitutions. No one has contended, and I am sure no one will care to contend, that the President of the United States would have been justified in calling a special session of the Congress to take such action on the basis of a national emergency, and no one has contended, and I am sure no one will contend, that it was a national emergency which controlled the policy of bringing up an anti-poll-tax bill as the first legislative action to be taken by the Senate at this special session.

So, at the outset of my remarks today on the subject of the anti-poll-tax bill, I wish to make it crystal clear that neither I nor any other southern Senator had any choice whatever in saying what legislation should be first considered at this special session. I also wish to make it crystal clear that every Senator from the South who shall stoutly resist the pending proposal to do an unwarranted and an unconstitutional thing to seven Southern States will promptly yield to any request from the Republican side to end debate on the anti-poll-tax bill for the consideration of legislation deemed to be either directly or indirectly related to a national emergency. What has actually occurred since we convened on last Monday is an effort to create a national emergency through an unwarranted and unconstitutional act which will affect, as so brilliantly explained last Thursday by my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], not only seven Southern States but each and every one of the 48 States of the Union whose star is so proudly proclaimed upon the blue field of our national emblem, an emblem which one of my ancestors, Col. John Armistead, of Caroline, kept flying throughout the British bombardment of Fort McHenry in the War of 1812, an action which challenges the oath that I took and which all of my distinguished colleagues took before we were permitted to qualify as a Senator of the United States from the State we so proudly represent. I know all other Senators are as familiar with that oath as I am, but for the benefit of those who may not know its solemn character I now repeat that oath:

I, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

The portion of that oath which needs to be stressed on this historic occasion is the part which reads:

I take this obligation freely, without mental reservation or purpose of evasion.

To that I desire to add the concluding sentences of a full-page advertisement on the subject of freedom, published July 4, 1948, by John W. Anderson, of Gary, Ind.:

Why learn from alien tyranny—too late—what your departed freedom meant to you?

Why feel—some early day—the lasting scorn of children now your friends?

Would you have children know you missed your chance to pass along to them that freedom your more thoughtful fathers did not fail to pass to you?

Take one long look deep into a youngster's eager eyes, before you seal his fate.

Then pledge to him your faith, your high resolve—to live, and act, American.

Mr. President, I was deeply impressed by the remark of the President pro tempore of the Senate in ruling on the cloture issue, when he referred to the necessity of protecting the rights of minorities

and when he referred to the kind of oath he had taken and which all of us, as plain, ordinary Members of this body, have taken, to uphold the Constitution and to do what we think is right between God and our consciences. He stated that, regardless of the fact that, personally, he should like to vote for the poll-tax bill, regardless of the fact that he thought it would be a good thing to pass it, he could not bring himself to override the rights of the minorities in this body as they exist under the rules of the Senate.

That is the issue which I propose to discuss on this poll-tax question. Before I have concluded I shall quote from a brilliant speech made by a former President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in which he referred to the unique quality of our Government in its protection of minorities, saying that, through the division of powers between the Federal Government on the one hand and the States on the other hand, there were many instances in which a bare majority in the Congress could not override the minority in the States.

I am looking at this time at a distinguished friend from a Western State. I know what is in his mind regarding whether a bare majority, let us say, of this Congress shall override the wishes of his State on an economic problem which would vitally affect his State. I know that is in his heart as I speak.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending bill for the following reasons:

First. It is unconstitutional, as demonstrated by debates in the Constitutional Convention, by explanations of the Constitution in the Federalist papers and in State ratifying conventions, and by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Second. It is unnecessary, because poll-tax payment as a prerequiste to voting is now imposed by only seven States where the trend is to eliminate the restriction by State action, as illustrated by the constitutional amendment which will be voted on in Virginia next year.

Third. It is undesirable, because it would create a confused situation in States which have the poll-tax requirement imbedded in their constitutions and because it would be another step in the direction of submerging the sovereignty of the States in an overpowering central government.

Let us first consider the history of the type of tax which is here involved and its association with the privilege of voting.

A point sometimes overlooked is that the poll tax came into being in this country not as a device for restricting suffrage, but as a liberalizing measure to increase the number of those eligible to vote.

When the Federal Constitution was adopted in 1789, only Vermont had universal suffrage. The general requirement for voting was ownership of property, usually real estate. The men who framed our Constitution knew that the State Constitutions adopted by Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey in 1776, by Georgia in 1777, and by Massachusetts in 1780, all contained provisions that voters must be males, at least 20 years of age, who possessed a freehold or estate. In 1789, the year after it had ratified the Constitution, the State of Georgia liberalized its requirements by extending the vote to those who had prepaid taxes, even though they did not have the property-ownership qualification. Other States took similar action and the adoption of the poll tax was quite generally recognized as the first major step in expansion of the suffrage.

Specifically, we find the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776, section 6, limited the vote to freemen 21 years and over, resident for 1 year next before the election, and who had paid taxes during that time. This qualification as to taxes was expanded by the State's 1790 constitution.

The New York Constitution of 1777, article VII, in describing qualifications of electors, included the phrase "and been rated and actually paid taxes to this State." This was retained in the 1801 revision.

The North Carolina Constitution of 1776, article VIII, specified residence of 12 months before an election, and added, "and shall have paid public taxes."

The South Carolina Constitution of 1778 provided prepayment of taxes as an alternative to land ownership as a voting qualification.

It must be observed, too, that the men who drafted the Constitution did not overlook, but carefully considered, the various restrictions placed on voting at the time.

CONVENTION DEBATES

Thus, in the debates at the Constitutional Convention, as reported by Elliott, we find James Madison suggesting that there be a definite statement of qualifications placed in the Constitution, and expressing the opinion that the freeholders of the country—landowners—would be the safest depository of republican liberty.

It was recognized, however, that the qualifications fixed by the States were not all the same, and that a uniform rule would require changes in their basic laws which might hinder ratification of the Constitution. Consequently, the Committee of Detail, on August 6, 1787, recommended that, "The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors of the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures"—volume 5, Elliott's Debates, page 377.

I digress, Mr. President, to comment on the question asked last Thursday by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] as to whether or not the word "same" was in the Constitution. No; the word "same" was not in the Constitution, but it was in the language of the committee which made the recommendation which was finally adopted as section 2 of article 1 of the Constitution. It is but another evidence, Mr. President, of the great wisdom and of the great skill of those who framed that instrument that not only did they set up a unique form of government, which has lasted longer than any other similar form of government in the world, and under which in a little over a century and a half we have become the most prosperous and, for the most part, the happiest people in the world, but it is also remarkable for the fact that they did not insert any unnecessary words. Gladstone knew what he was saying when he stated, in effect, that the Constitution was the greatest instrument ever struck off at a given time by the hand and purpose of man. It is simplicity itself, with no surpluses, boiled right down to the final analysis, and that is what we are coming to in this debate—what was this boiled down to and what did it mean?

The proposal of the committee on detail which I have just mentioned touched off a long debate, in which Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, advocated a uniform rule in the Constitution limiting the franchise to landowners. He objected to making the question of qualifications dependent on the will of the States, not because he thought they would unduly restrict the electorate, but because he feared they would be too generous in extending the privilege.

Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, warned, however, that the right of suffrage was a tender point, carefully guarded in the State constitutions, and that tampering with it might wreck the new National Government.

James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, also took issue with Morris. He said it would be difficult to settle on a uniform rule for all States, and he pointed in particular to the possibility that a disagreeable situation might arise if electors of the State legislature and Congress were not the same.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. For what purpose?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make some remarks for 7 or 8 minutes in the Senator's time without his losing the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I regret very much, but the Senator from Virginia was about an hour late in starting his remarks, and he is going to run out of his own time before the shades of night fall. I regret very much that I cannot give my time to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, because I do not have enough left for myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Senator from Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Not a 7- or 8-minute question.

Mr. LUCAS. A very short question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall yield if it is a very vital question. I am trying to discuss a vital issue, and I hope the Senator will not ask me a question which is not relevant to what I am discussing.

Mr. LUCAS. It is hardly relevant, and yet in a way it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Let me yield after I finish the branch of the sub-

ject I am now discussing. I do not like to have broken up my discussion of the interpretation of the provision to which I have been referring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that all these remarks be stricken from the RECORD in order that the Senator's thoughts on this very important matter will not be disconnected.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I want the Senator to understand that I should like the best way in the world to yield, but I lost an hour and a half in getting started. I have prepared a speech which I am trying to complete today, because I hope it is a logical discussion of what is at stake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia declines to yield. The RECORD will stand. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. I desired to interrupt the Senator in order to inform him and the Senate what Governor Dewey does not propose to do in connection with what the Senator is discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. "It would be very hard and disagreeable," Wilson said, as reported by Madison, "for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for Representatives in the State legislature, and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature" (5 Ell. Deb. 385).

George Mason, of Virginia, also contended for the very point I am stressing today—that a power to alter the qualifications of voters would be a dangerous power in the hands of the National Legislature. Once the principle is established that the Congress can make such changes, the power used at one time to expand the electorate may be used at another to restrict it, and, theoretically at least, the restriction could be carried so far that we would have a despotism.

Mr. Mason called attention to the fact that eight or nine States already had abolished land-holding qualifications, although most of them continued to require some material evidence of the citizen's responsible interest in his Government.

At the conclusion of this debate the Morris proposal to limit the ballot to freeholders was defeated by a vote of seven States to one and the committee plan was adopted without a dissenting vote. Its language was changed only slightly, and became that part of section 2 of article I of the Constitution which reads:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Nowhere in the original body of the original Constitution will be found a restriction on the discretion of the States in fixing the qualifications of voters. There are some restrictions in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth amendments. But, as I shall show, these restrictions do not cover the point at issue in considering this bill. It should be noted, too, that they were made effective by amending the Constitution, which is the only proper approach that should be taken by those who seek to eliminate the poll-tax requirement, and that is the approach which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] indicated the southern Senators would not oppose if it was made at this special session.

The thinking of the men who wrote our Constitution is indicated not only by the Convention debates, but also by contemporary writings and statements.

We find, for example, that Thomas Jefferson favored payment of taxes as an alternative to holding land as a qualification for voters. In his draft for a proposed Constitution for Virginia, written in June 1776 while he was in Philadelphia as a member of the Continental Congress, Jefferson proposed:

> All male persons of full age and sane mind, having a freehold estate in (one-fourth of an acre) of land in any town or in (25) acres of land in the country, and all persons resident in the colony who shall have paid scott and lot to government the last (2 years) shall have right to give their vote in the election of their respective representatives.

In this same draft, incidentally, Jefferson proposed that—

> No person hereafter coming into this country shall be held within the same in slavery under any pretext whatever.

That, Mr. President, was proposed by Thomas Jefferson for the Virginia Constitution in 1776, and it was proposed to be written into the Federal Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787. It was primarily the State of Massachusetts and other maritime States that were bringing the slaves into the South which objected to that being written into the Constitution as proposed by the Representatives from Virginia, and they said that if that were put into the Constitution they would walk out of the convention before any constitution had been agreed to.

Jefferson gave a further exposition of his ideas on suffrage in his 1873 draft for a Constitution for Virginia in which he proposed:

> All free male citizens of full age, and sane mind, who for 1 year before shall have been resident in the county or shall through the whole of that time have possessed therein real property of the value of ——; or shall for the same time have been enrolled in the militia, and no others shall have a right to vote for delegates for the said county, and for senatorial electors for the district.

FEDERALIST INTERPRETATION

As has already been indicated, the members of the Constitutional Convention were conscious of the need to satisfy the people of the various States on this touchy subject of suffrage rights and it was one of the subjects which received attention in the Federalist papers which gave the most extensive contemporary exposition of the Constitution.

In No. 52 of the Federalist, written by either Madison or Hamilton, it was pointed out that the Constitution made the qualification for Federal electors the same as those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

> The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government.

The Federalist author continued:

> It was incumbent on the convention, therefore to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States, would have been improper for the same reason; and for the additional reason that it would have rendered too dependent on the State governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone.

Mark the following words of the paragraph in the quotation:

> To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention.
>
> The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself. It will be safe to the United States, because, being fixed by the State constitutions, it is not alterable by the State governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

Then, in the Fifty-fourth Federalist, which also may have been written by either Madison or Hamilton, it was remarked:

> The qualifications on which the right of suffrage depend are not, perhaps, the same in any two States. In some of the States the difference is very material. In every State, a certain proportion of inhabitants are deprived of this right by the constitution of the State, who will be included in the census by which the Federal Constitution apportions the Representatives.

Again in the Fifty-seventh Federalist the question was asked:

> Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives?

And the writer replied to his own question:

> Not the rich, more than the poor; nor the learned, more than the ignorant; nor the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States. They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

Discussing the subject of qualification of electors further in the Fifty-ninth Federalist, Hamilton wrote:

> It will not be alleged that an election law could have been framed and inserted in the Constitution which would have been always applicable to every probable change in the situation of the country; and it will therefore not be denied that a discretionary power over elections ought to exist somewhere. It will, I presume, be as readily conceded that there were only three ways in which this power could have been reasonably modified and disposed; that it must either have been lodged wholly in the National Legislature, or wholly in the State legislatures, or primarily in the latter and ultimately in the former. The last mode has, with reason, been preferred by the Convention. They have submitted the regulation of elections for the Federal Government, in the first instance, to the local administrations; which,

in ordinary cases, and when no improper views prevail, may be both more convenient and more satisfactory; but they have reserved to the national authority a right to interpose, whenever extraordinary circumstances might render that interposition necessary to its safety.

Note that Hamilton, always an advocate of strong central government and fearful of State encroachments, in attempting to win support for the compromise provisions of the Constitution which he had helped to frame claimed no more than that the national authority might interpose itself in the regulation of elections when "necessary to its safety."

He argued that giving the exclusive power of regulating elections for the National Government to the State legislatures would leave the existence of the Union at their mercy, since they could annihilate it simply by refusing to hold any election for national officials.

Turning then to the other side of the picture, he said:

Suppose an article had been introduced into the Constitution empowering the United States to regulate the elections for the particular States, would any man have hesitated to condemn it, both as an unwarrantable transposition of power and as a premeditated engine for the destruction of State governments?

Mind you, that is the great Alexander Hamilton, of New York, speaking. Today a cloture petition was signed by a very brilliant Member of the Senate, the political heir of Alexander Hamilton, of New York. He sent to the desk a cloture petition to shut off debate on what is involved in this question, and to bring the question to a prompt vote in the Senate. For what purpose? For the purpose of enacting a law by the Congress to regulate the qualifications of the voters in the States. Therefore I regret that this distinguished political heir of Alexander Hamilton is not at the moment in the Chamber, in order that I might bring to his attention what that master mind, that burning patriot, that architect of a great form of government, who helped to write this provision into the Constitution, said that it meant.

I continue to read from the statement of Alexander Hamilton:

The violation of principle in this case would have required no comment—

That is Alexander Hamilton, speaking about an effort of the Congress to fix the qualifications of voters.

The violation of principle, in this case, would have required no comment; and to an unbiased observer, it will not be less apparent in the project of subjecting the existence of the National Government, in a similar respect, to the pleasure of the State governments. An impartial view of the matter cannot fail to result in a conviction, that each, as far as possible, ought to depend on itself for its own preservation.

Alexander Hamilton said that the Federal Government would depend for its preservation upon section 4, by which the Congress may regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections to make sure that all the States have such elections; and that the States would preserve their integrity and sovereignty under section 2 of article I, which gives them the power of fixing the qualifications of voters, subject only to the restriction that they cannot impose on the electors or voters for Federal offices any different requirements than they impose on those who they say are qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Continuing his discussion in the Sixtieth Federalist, Hamilton said that with the House of Representatives being elected directly by the people, the Senate by the State legislatures, and the President by electors chosen for the purpose by the people, there would be little probability of a common interest to cement these different branches in a predilection for any particular class of electors.

As to the Senate he said:

It is impossible that any regulation of time and manner, which is all that is proposed to be submitted to the National Government in respect to that body, can affect the spirit which will direct the choice of its members.

Further on in the same paper, discussing fears that elections might be manipulated in the interest of the "rich and the well born," Hamilton said the only way of securing such preference would be by prescribing qualifications of property either for those who may elect or be elected.

"But," he added, "this forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government."

Again I say that I am sorry that the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is not present. I am afraid that he does not know what his patron saint Alexander Hamilton has said on this subject. Who knew more about the Constitution than did Alexander Hamilton? Who would rise in the Senate and say, "Alexander Hamilton was an old fogey. He had a befuddled mind. He thought he was trying to write something in the Constitution that he understood, but he did not know what he was talking about, and when he wrote this statement in the Federalist papers he did not know what he was talking about. This has no binding effect on us now in construing language" which to most of us appears to be so plain.

For whatever it may be worth I quote again what Alexander Hamilton said:

This forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government. Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution, and are unalterable by the legislature.

He was referring, of course, to this body. Alexander Hamilton wrote as clearly as English language could be expressed that the power to pass on the qualifications of voters was left expressly by the Constitution to the States, and he stated that such powers are unalterable by the legislature.

The clear distinction Hamilton made, in explaining that the Federal Government might regulate the time, the place, and the manner of holding elections but could not change the qualifications of the electors, was also recognized and emphasized by others.

RATIFYING CONVENTION DEBATES

In the Massachusetts convention, in answer to a query as to whether Congress might prescribe a property qualification for voters, Mr. Rufus King, a member of of the Federal Convention, said:

The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding; for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of elections, not the qualifications of the electors.

I am sorry that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who today signed a cloture petition to bring about consideration of this very kind of bill to let the Congress pass upon qualifications of voters, is not present to hear me quote from his distinguished political ancestor, Mr. Rufus King, a member of the delegation from Massachusetts, who helped to write the language of the Constitution, and a member of the ratifying convention in Massachusetts who helped to interpret what that language meant. Are we to say that we know more than did Mr. Rufus King about what he meant in Philadelphia? Are we to say that we know more about what Mr. Rufus King meant when he urged Massachusetts to ratify this document? There were those in that convention who were fearful, just as the people of Virginia were fearful, that the Federal Government would gain too much power. They were complaining that the Federal Government should not have power to regulate the times, places, and manner of elections. Are we to assume that we know more about what he had in his mind; or are we going to go by what he himself said he had in his mind? If we are, here is what he said:

For the power of control given by this section—

He is debating how far the Federal Government could go—

extends to the manner of elections, not the qualifications of the electors.

And James Wilson, who had warned in the Federal Convention of the difficulty that might result if qualifications of State and national electors were different, had this to say in the Pennsylvania convention:

In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives, we are to inquire who are qualified to be electors of the legislature of each State. If there be no legislature in the States, there can be no electors of them; if there be no such electors, there is no criterion to know who are qualified to elect Members of the House of Representatives. By this short, plain deduction, the existence of State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the General Government.

In the Virginia Convention, Wilson Nicholas, one of the delegates, said:

If, therefore, by the proposed plan, it is left uncertain in whom the right of suffrage is to rest, or if it has placed that right in improper hands, I shall admit that it is a radical defect; but in this plan there is a fixed rule for determining the qualifications of electors, and that rule the most judicious that could possibly have been devised, because it refers to a criterion which cannot be changed. A qualification that gives a right to elect representatives

for the State legislatures, gives also, by this Constitution, a right to choose Representatives for the General Government.

All those who are familiar with what happened in the ratifying convention at Richmond know how Patrick Henry fought the ratification of the Constitution on the ground that it gave the Federal Government too much power; and this is one of the things that the question was raised about: Can the Federal Government pass on the qualifications of the voters; or can Virginia, as in the past, fix those qualifications, and the Federal Government just determine the times, places, and manner, if it wishes to do so, of holding those elections, where those who have the right to vote under the State law can then freely participate?

Wilson Nicholas was a member of the Philadelphia Convention. He came back to Richmond and explained the meaning of what had been done at Philadelphia. He gave the members of the Richmond ratifying convention most positive assurance that the Federal Government could not and never would undertake to pass upon and fix the qualifications of voters. Even with that assurance, Mr. President, the Constitution was ratified in Virginia by a majority of only eight votes. I am very proud of the fact that I had two ancestors in that convention, Col. James Gordon, of Lancaster, and his son, James Gordon, Jr., close friends of Madison. I am proud they voted to ratify the Constitution, and I am glad to stand here and inform the Senate what the men who ratified it had in mind when they did so, and how wrong it would be to ignore the intentions of the framers of the Constitution and the intentions of those who participated in the convention and to override the States and to assume a right which they themselves have, and then take the step of pulling out one stone of the foundation of our constitutional representative democracy.

Again, in explaining the plan to the North Carolina Convention, John Steele said:

> Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government. Does it not expressly provide that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors: The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote. The Constitution expressly says that the qualifications are those which entitle a man to vote for a State representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way.

Mr. President, one would think that the Senate had just been confronted with the question as to whether we could change the qualifications of electors; but John Steele, as I recall, was a delegate from North Carolina to the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention, and he returned to his State convention to explain the meaning of what had been done at the Philadelphia Convention. The members of the State ratifying convention wished to know whether the Federal Government could change this procedure. He said to them, I repeat:

> Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors?

KEEPING FAITH WITH STATES

Mr. President, these excerpts from the debates in the ratifying conventions point to the correctness of the conclusion reached by Mr. Jesse F. Orton, New York attorney and student of constitutional law, who said in a brief on this subject prepared several years ago:

> This sentence (in article I, section 2, saying electors shall have the same qualifications as electors of the most numerous branch of State legislatures), the only one on "qualifications," was obviously a material representation and also a solemn pledge, that each ratifying State would be permitted, as in fact it was commanded, to use in electing its Representatives the same qualifications used in electing the larger branch of its legislature. * * * This provision in section 2 of article I was definitely understood by each State as such a pledge and absolute assurance. Every State ratified the Constitution upon that express condition, many times repeated during the period of ratification. The pledge was irrevocable, except by amendment, approved by three-fourths of the States. It was also considered a wise provision for the Nation. The United States has never dishonored that pledge. To dishonor it now would be an act of perfidy.

Those are not my words; those are the words of a very distinguished attorney from New York City.

He goes on to say:

> Few historical facts are more conclusively established than the fact that this pledge was made for the express and avowed purpose of obtaining the consent of the States to the adoption of the Constitution. It was repeated and emphasized in the Federalist, written chiefly by Madison and Hamilton, and in other writings and oral statements for the sole purpose of securing ratification. In the ratifying conventions it was used to satisfy any "doubting Thomas" that the States were absolutely protected in their power to control the suffrage in the election of Representatives.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of permitting me to ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. With the understanding that I do not yield the floor or shall not lose any of my rights to the floor, I yield for the purpose of permitting a request to be made for an insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not raise any objection at this time, and I certainly do not wish to interfere with the Senator's right to the floor; but I wish to point out that the time is rapidly approaching when we may have to have a very rigid interpretation and enforcement of the Senate rules in regard to yielding, and it may also perhaps be necessary to begin to hold night sessions, so that the Senate may proceed with its business. I am not objecting at this time, though.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall yield this time, but from now until I conclude my remarks on this subject, I shall decline to yield any more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the Senator's position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks the Senator from Virginia to yield for the purpose of requesting unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD, without prejudicing the rights on the part of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With that understanding, the insertion will be made.

(Mr. MAGNUSON's request appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appriate heading.)

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Continuing the quotation:

> Without this assurance, consent would have been refused by many of the States. With it, ratification was obtained in Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia by a vote of less than 53 percent of members present and voting.
>
> In section 4, after providing, "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof," it was provided that "the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators." This grant of power to set at naught the election laws passed by the States in obedience to this command in section 4 met with more violent and angry protests probably than any other provision in the Constitution. Section 4 undoubtedly lost many votes of delegates who otherwise would have voted for ratification. If Congress had been given similar power to set at naught the action of the States with respect to qualifications, there is little doubt that nine States would not have ratified and the proposed Union would not have been formed.

All that, Mr. President, was a quotation from this distinguished lawyer in New York.

Certainly there is nothing equivocal about the language of article I, section 2, which says those who vote for national officers in each State shall have the same qualifications as those who vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. And section 4 of article I is precise in limiting the control of Congress to the times, places, and manner of electing Senators and Representatives.

The significance of these limitations is reinforced by the fact that as late as 1912, when the seventeenth amendment was proposed by Congress, providing for popular election of Senators, language was used identical to that of article I, section 2. This amendment says:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

This, mind you, Mr. President, was adopted after more than a century of experience with the suffrage provisions contained in the Constitution and also after there had been ample time to observe operations of the newer poll taxes which were adopted between 1875 and 1908.

It is a matter of record, however, that when the seventeenth amendment was

debated in Congress, no issue was raised on the right of the States to determine the qualification of electors. But, on the contrary, serious consideration was given to a proposal to take away from Congress, by amendment, the authority to alter the times, places, and manner of holding elections.

Searching elsewhere than in article I for constitutional justification for abolishing the poll-tax requirement, supporters of such legislation have sometimes cited article IV, section 4, which says:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

Analysis of this section as it was understood by those who wrote it tends, however, to strengthen rather than weaken the position of those who claim the States have a legitimate right to require tax payments as a prerequisite to voting.

In considering article IV, section 4, in No. 43 of the Federalist, Mr. Madison frankly raised the question whether or not the guaranty of a republican form of government might not "become a pretext for alteration in the State governments, without the concurrence of the States themselves." Answering his own question, he said:

If the General Government should interpose by virtue of this constitutional authority, it will be, of course, bound to pursue the authority. But the authority extends no further than to a guaranty of a republican form of government, which supposes a preexisting government of the form which is to be guaranteed. So long therefore as the existing republican forms are continued by the States, they are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever the States may choose to substitute other republican forms, they have a right to do so, and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is, that they shall not exchange republican for antirepublican constitutions, a restriction which, it is presumed, will hardly be considered as a grievance.

Those are the words of James Madison, explaining the meaning of that section of the Constitution. It will be noted that Madison believed that the guaranty applied to the forms of government existing in the States at the time the Constitution was written, and as I already have indicated, these governments included property or tax qualifications on the right to vote.

In Willoughby's authoritative book on the Constitution (1, 2d ed. 215) we also find him saying this with respect to article IV, section 4:

It will be noticed that the Constitution does not itself define the term "republican form of government." It has, however, always been an accepted rule of construction that the technical and special terms used in the Constitution are to be given that meaning which they had at the time that instrument was framed. This is but reasonable, for, in default of anything to the contrary, those who drafted the Constitution are to be presumed to have intended the words which they used to have that meaning they knew them to have. For a definition, then, of "republican government" we must discover what, in 1787, such a political form was considered to be. Certainly we may say that the governments of the Thirteen Original States as they existed at the time the Constitution was drafted must have been considered as illustrating the republican type. Furthermore, the constitutions of all those States which have been admitted to the Union since 1787 must be regarded as having been impliedly considered republican by Congress at the time of the giving of its assent to their entrance into the Union.

Also, discussing article I, section 4, in the Virginia ratifying convention, Mr. Madison explained:

It was found impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State governments, as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the General Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution.

And, considering the State governments and General Government as distinct bodies, acting in different and independent capacities for the people, it was thought the particular regulations should be submitted to the former and the general regulations to the latter. Were they exclusively under the control of the State governments, the General Government might easily be dissolved. But if they be regulated properly by the State legislatures, the congressional control will very probably never be exercised. The power appears to me satisfactory, and as unlikely to be abused as any part of the Constitution.

This, it will be noted, deals only with the times, places, and manner of holding elections and not with qualifications of voters since, under the provision of article I, section 2, a State could not attempt to dissolve the General Government by disqualifying voters without automatically dissolving its own government.

COURT DECISIONS

Now, let us see what our courts have had to say about the dividing line between State and Federal powers as applied to voters and elections.

After the adoption of the fourteenth amendment a woman in Missouri, where the right to vote was limited to males, sued the registrar because he refused to put her name on the list of voters. She contended she was a citizen of the United States under the amendment and that the State could not abridge her right as such a citizen to vote for Presidential electors.

In this case, reported as *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wallace 162) and decided in 1875, the Supreme Court denied her claim. The Court held that since she was a citizen, born of citizen parents before the amendment, her status with respect to voting was not changed by it, because the right to vote before the amendment was not necessarily one of the privileges or immunities of citizenship. This was demonstrated by the necessity for the fifteenth amendment, which protected the Negro from being excluded from voting because of his color but did not affect his wife, who remained debarred on account of sex. It took the later nineteenth amendment to remove that bar.

The fourteenth amendment, the Court said, "does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone."

Another issue raised in this case was whether or not the State, in refusing to allow women to vote, had failed to provide the republican form of government guaranteed by article IV, section 4.

On this point the Court said:

The guaranty is of a republican form of government. No particular government is designated as republican, neither is the exact form to be guaranteed, in any manner especially designated. Here, as in other parts of the instrument, we are compelled to resort elsewhere to ascertain what was intended. The guaranty necessarily implies a duty on the part of the States themselves to provide such a government. All the States had governments when the Constitution was adopted. In all, the people participated to some extent, through their representatives selected in the manner specifically provided. These governments the Constitution did not change. They were accepted precisely as they were, and it is, therefore, to be presumed that they were such as it was the duty of the States to provide.

Thus we have unmistakable evidence of what was republican in form within the meaning of that term as employed by the Constitution.

That is the language of the Court, Mr. President. I am still quoting from the Court's opinion:

As has been seen (in the argument that has gone before) all the citizens of the States were not invested with the right of suffrage. In all, save perhaps New Jersey, this right was only bestowed upon men and not upon all of them. Under these circumstances, it is certainly now too late to contend that a government is not republican, within the meaning of this guaranty in the Constitution, because women are not made voters.

While the Court in this instance was considering particularly the limitations in the State governments which prevented women from voting, the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Waite cited other types of limitation as well.

The opinion, at page 172, contained this summary statement:

When the Federal Constitution was adopted, all the States, with the exception of Rhode Island and Connecticut, had constitutions of their own. These two continued to act under their charters from the Crown. Upon an examination of these constitutions we find that in no State were all citizens permitted to vote. Each State determined for itself who should have that power.

Thus in New Hampshire, "every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges, and places unincorporated in the State, of 21 years of age and upwards, excepting paupers and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request," were its voters; in Massachusetts, "every male inhabitant of 21 years of age and upwards, having a freehold estate within the commonwealth of the annual income of 3 pounds, or any estate of the value of 60 pounds"; in Rhode Island, "such as are admitted free of the company and society" of the Colony; in Connecticut, such persons as had "maturity in years, quiet and peaceable behavior, a civil conversation, and 40 shillings freehold or 40 pounds personal estate," if so certified by the selectmen; in New York, "every male inhabitant of full age who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of the State for 6 months immediately preceding the day of election * * * if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder possessing a freehold of the value of 20 pounds within the county, or have rented a tenement therein of the yearly value of 40 shillings, and been rated and actually paid taxes to

the State"; in New Jersey, "all inhabitants * * * of full age who are worth 50 pounds, proclamation-money, clear estate in the same, and have resided in the county in which they claim a vote for 12 months immediately preceding the election"; in Pennsylvania, "every freeman of the age of 21 years, having resided in the State for 2 years next before the election, and within that time paid a State or county tax which shall have been assessed at least 6 months before the election"; in Delaware and Virginia, "as exercised by law at present"; in Maryland, "all freemen above 21 years of age having a freehold of 50 acres of land in the county in which they offer to vote and residing therein, and all freemen having property in the State above the value of 30 pounds current money, and having resided in the county in which they offer to vote one whole year next preceding the election"; in North Carolina, for Senators, "all freemen of the age of 21 years who have been inhabitants of any one county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of election, and possessed of a freehold within the same county of 50 acres of land for 6 months next before and at the day of election," and for members of the house of commons, "all freemen of the age of 21 years who have been inhabitants in any one county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of any election, and shall have paid public taxes"; in South Carolina, "every free white man of the age of 21 years, being a citizen of the State and having resided therein 2 years previous to the day of election and who hath a freehold of 50 acres of land, or a town lot of which he hath been legally seized and possessed for at least 6 months before such election, or (not having such freehold or town lot), hath been a resident within the election district in which he offers to give his vote 6 months before such election, and hath paid a tax the preceding year of three shillings sterling towards the support of the government"; and in Georgia, "such citizen and inhabitants of the State as shall have attained to the age of 21 years, and shall have paid tax for the year next preceding the election, and shall have resided 6 months within the county."

I am still quoting from the decision of Mr. Justice Story. The Court said:

In this condition of the law in respect to suffrage in the several States it cannot for a moment be doubted that if it had been intended to make all citizens of the United States voters the framers of the Constitution would not have left it to implication. So important a change in the condition of citizenship as it actually existed, if intended, would have been expressly declared.

That is the first case of the United States Supreme Court on this point. The decisions go right down the line, saying that if there had been anything anywhere in the Constitution that even looked in the direction of the Federal Government's having any control over qualifications in so vital a matter, as my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] said last Thursday—and I have quoted from a judge who said the same thing—in so tender a matter to the States as is the question of who shall vote, the first case said that the framers of the Constitution would not have left it to implication or guesswork; it would have been expressly written in. It was not written in, and, therefore, the first case says that it is not in there.

I ask the Senators to listen to the other cases, because I shall go down the line from the first case to the case cited by the Senator from Mississippi, which was decided in 1941, 6 months after the case was decided upon which some Members of the Senate are relying. The Supreme Court has never deviated, as I propose to show, from the first case right down to 1941, in holding in clear, express, and explicit terms, that the States have exclusive jurisdiction over fixing the qualifications of voters, and that there is nothing anywhere in the Constitution, by indirection, by implication, or in any other way, that can give this proposed power to the Federal Government.

The Court also noted that the Constitution of Rhode Island, which was adopted in 1843, contained qualifications for voting, including a property-ownership requirement.

I call attention to the fact that aside from the various property qualifications of the several States, the list of restrictions as cited in this court opinion included New Hampshire's denial of the vote to "persons excused from paying taxes at their own request"; New York's alternate requirement that voters who did not possess property must have "been rated and actually paid taxes to the State"; Pennsylvania's requirement that voters must pay a tax "assessed at least 6 months before the election" and the tax payment provisions of North Carolina, South Carolina, and of Georgia.

I hope the distinguished Senators from Connecticut will note, too, that at the time the Federal Constitution was adopted the right to vote in their State could be denied to anyone whom the selectmen refused to certify as having "quiet and peaceable behavior and civil conversation."

A little later on, Mr. President, I shall quote from the constitution of one of the great western States. It is not so far west as California, but it is near the Pacific coast. The constitution of that State provides that if anyone believes in polygamy or in anything which resembles what the Mormons used to believe in, he can never vote in that State. That provision is still in the constitution of that State. I have not heard anyone say that Idaho did not have the right to say who can vote in that State. No one has ever challenged that. I never heard anyone challenge the Constitution of Connecticut of 1803, providing that, in addition to paying taxes and residing in Connecticut, the selectmen—and I suppose that means the town council, or some such body—would have to certify that a man was quiet and peaceful in his behavior, and civil in his conversation.

Yet, after pointing out all these restrictions, Mr. Chief Justice Waite concluded that they were acceptable features of a republican form of government and were so recognized by the framers of our Constitution.

The decision of the Court in the case of Minor against Happersett, insofar as applicability of the fourteenth amendment to voting privileges was concerned, was influenced, of course, by the important slaughterhouse cases, which had been decided just 2 years earlier, in 1872.

SLAUGHTERHOUSE CASES

It was these cases which drew a clear line between national citizenship and State citizenship and established that the privileges adhering to one did not necessarily apply to the other.

The State of Louisiana had passed a law to regulate slaughterhouses near New Orleans and suit was brought on the ground that this law discriminated against certain citizens who had previously engaged in business, and that it therefore violated the fourteenth amendment.

More than a hundred pages in the reports—16 Wallace 36—were occupied by the Court's exhaustive analysis of the fourteenth amendment.

In its opinion, the Court said:

The first section of the fourteenth amendment, to which our attention is more specially invited, opens with a definition of citizenship—not only citizenship of the United States, but citizenship of the States. No such definition was previously found in the Constitution, nor had any attempt been made to define it by act of Congress. It had been the occasion of much discussion in the courts, by the executive departments, and in the public journals. It has been said by eminent judges that no man was a citizen of the United States except as he was a citizen of one of the States composing the Union. Those, therefore, who had been born and resided always in the District of Columbia or in the Territories, though within the United States, were not citizens. Whether this proposition was sound or not had never been judicially decided. But it had been held by this Court, in the celebrated Dred Scott case, only a few years before the outbreak of the Civil War, that a man of African descent, whether a slave or not, was not and could not be a citizen of a State or of the United States. This decision, while it met condemnation of some of the ablest statesmen and constitutional lawyers of the country, had never been overruled; and if it was to be accepted as a constitutional limitation of the right of citizenship, then all the Negro race who had recently been made freemen were still not only not citizens but were incapable of becoming so by anything short of an amendment to the Constitution.

To remove this difficulty primarily, and to establish a clear and comprehensive definition of citizenship which should declare what should constitute citizenship of the United States and also citizenship of a State, the first clause of the first section was framed.

That clause is the one reading—

All persons born and naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

The Court continued:

The first observation we have to make on this clause is, that it puts at rest both the questions which we stated to have been subject to differences of opinion. It declares that persons may be citizens of the United States without regard to their citizenship of a particular State, and it overturns the Dred Scott decision by making all persons born within the United States and subject to its jurisdiction citizens of the United States. That its main purpose was to establish the citizenship of the Negro there can be no doubt. The phrase "subject to its jurisdiction" was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign states born within the United States.

The next observation is more important in view of the arguments of counsel in the present case. It is, that the distinction between citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a State is clearly recognized and established. Not only may a man be a

citizen of the United States without being a citizen of a State, but an important element is necessary to convert the former into the latter. He must reside within the State to make him a citizen of it, but it is only necessary that he should be born or naturalized in the United States to be a citizen of the Union.

It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the United States, and a citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other, and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual.

We think this distinction and its explicit recognition in this amendment of great weight in this argument, because the next paragraph of this same section, which is the one mainly relied on by the plaintiffs in error, speaks only of privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, and does not speak of those of citizens of the several States. The argument, however, in favor of the plaintiffs rests wholly on the assumption that the citizenship is the same, and the privileges and immunities guaranteed by the clause are the same.

The language is: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

It is a little remarkable, if this clause was intended as a protection to the citizens of a State against the legislative power of his own State, that the words "citizen of the State" should be left out when it is so carefully used, and used in contradistinction to citizens of the United States, in the very sentence which precedes it. It is too clear for argument that the change of phraseology was adopted understandingly and with a purpose.

Of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the United States, and of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the State, and what they respectively are, we will presently consider; but we wish to state here that it is only the former which are placed by this clause under the protection of the Federal Constitution and that the latter, whatever they may be, are not intended to have any additional protection by this paragraph of the amendment.

If, then, there is a difference between the privileges and immunities belonging to a citizen of the United States as such, and those belonging to the citizen of the State as such, the latter must rest for their security and protection where they have heretofore rested; for they are not embraced by this paragraph of the amendment.

The first occurrence of the words "privileges and immunities" in our constitutional history is to be found in the fourth of the articles of the old Confederation.

It declares "that the better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendships and intercourse among the people of the different States of this Union, the free inhabitants of each of these States, paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States; and the people of each State shall have free ingress and regress to and from any other State, and shall enjoy therein all the privileges of trade and commerce, subject to the same duties, impositions, and restrictions as the inhabitants thereof respectively."

In the Constitution of the United States, which superseded the Articles of Confederation, the corresponding provision is found in section 2 of the fourth article, in the following words: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States."

There can be but little question that the purpose of both these provisions is the same, and that the privileges and immunities intended are the same in each. In the article of the Confederation we have some of these specifically mentioned and enough perhaps to give some general idea of the class of civil rights meant by the phrase.

Fortunately, we are not without judicial instruction on this clause of the Constitution. The first and the leading case on the subject is that of Corfield against Coryell, decided by Mr. Justice Washington in the Circuit Court for the District of Pennsylvania in 1823.

"The inquiry," he says, "is, What are the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States? We feel no hesitation in confining these expressions to those privileges and immunities which are fundamental—which belong of right to the citizens of all free governments, and which have at all times been enjoyed by the citizens of the several States which compose the Union, from the time of their becoming free, independent, and sovereign. What these fundamental principles are, it would be more tedious than difficult to enumerate. They may all, however, be comprehended under the following general heads: Protection by the Government with the right to acquire and possess property of every kind and to pursue and obtain happiness and safety, subject, nevertheless, to such restraints as the Government may prescribe for the general good of the whole."

This definition of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States is adopted in the main by this Court in the recent case of Ward against the State of Maryland, while it declines to undertake an authoritative definition beyond what was necessary to that decision. The description, when taken to include others not named but which are of the same general character, embraces nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted. They are, in the language of Judge Washington, those rights which are fundamental. Throughout his opinion they are spoken of as rights belonging to the individual as a citizen of a State. They are so spoken of in the constitutional provision which he was construing. And they have always been held to be the class of rights which the State governments were created to establish and secure.

Please notice that last phrase used by the Court:

They have always been held to be the class of rights which the State governments were created to establish and secure.

To continue quoting from the Court's opinion in the Slaughter House cases:

In the case of Paul against Virginia, the Court, in expounding this clause of the Constitution, says that the privileges and immunities secured to citizens of each State in the several States by the provision in question are those privileges and immunities which are common to the citizens of the latter States under their constitutions and laws by virtue of their being citizens.

The constitutional provision there alluded to did not create those rights, which it calls privileges and immunities of citizens of the States. It threw around them in that clause no security for the citizen of the State in which they were claimed or exercised. Nor did it profess to control the power of the State governments over the rights of its own citizens.

Note well that last statement of the Supreme Court:

Nor did it profess to control the power of the State governments over the rights of its own citizens.

But that is what the legislation now under consideration proposes to do.

Continuing with our citation of the Court's opinion:

Its sole purpose was to declare to the several States that whatever those rights, as you grant or establish them to your own citizens, as you limit or qualify, or impose restrictions on their exercise, the same, neither more nor less, shall be the measure of the rights of citizens of other States within your jurisdiction.

It would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citations of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments (that is, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth) no claim or pretense was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection beyond the very few express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposed upon the States—such, for instance, as the prohibition against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts. But with the exception of these and a few other restrictions, the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative power of the States, and without that of the Federal Government.

Was it the purpose of the fourteenth amendment, by the simple declaration that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States to transfer the security and protection of rights which we have mentioned to the Federal Government? And where it declared that Congress shall have the power to enforce that article, was it intended to bring within the power of Congress the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the States?

All this and more must follow if the proposition of the plaintiff is sound.

For not only are these rights subject to the control of Congress whenever in its discretion any of them are supposed to be abridged by State legislation but that body may also pass laws in advance limiting and restricting the exercise of power by the States in their most ordinary and usual functions, as in its judgment it may think proper on all such subjects and still further such construction would constitute this court a perpetual censor upon all legislation of the States on the civil rights of their own citizens, with authority to nullify such as it did not approve, as consistent with those rights as existed at the time of the adoption of this amendment. The argument, we admit, is not always the most conclusive which is drawn from the consequences urged against the adoption of a particular construction of an instrument. But when, as in the case before us, those consequences are so serious, so far reaching and pervading, so great a departure from the structure and spirit of our institutions, when the effect is to fetter and degrade the State governments by subjecting them to the control of Congress in the exercise of powers heretofore universally conceded to them of the most ordinary and fundamental character, when in fact it radically changes the whole theory of the relations of the State and Federal Governments to each other and of both these governments to the people, the argument has a force that is irresistible in the absence of language which expresses such a purpose too clearly to admit of doubt.

Then, after pointing out that the Federal Government does unquestionably have responsibility for protecting the privileges and immunities of citizens under certain circumstances, such as when they are on the high seas or within the jurisdiction of a foreign government, the Court said it did not see in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments "any purpose to destroy the main features of the general system" of our Government.

The opinion concluded:

Under the pressure of all the excited feeling growing out of the war, our statesmen have still believed that the existence of the States with powers for domestic and local government including the regulation of civil rights, the rights of person and of property was essential to the perfect working of our complex form of government, though they have thought proper to impose additional limitations on the States and to confer additional power on that of the Nation.

But whatever fluctuations may be seen in the history of public opinion on this subject during the period of our national existence we think it will be found that this court, so far as its functions required, has always held with a steady and an even hand the balance between State and Federal power, and we trust that such may continue to be the history of its relation to that subject so long as it shall have duties to perform which demand of it a construction of the Constitution or of any of its parts.

UNITED STATES *v.* CRUICKSHANK

In 1876, the year after the case of Minor against Happersett was decided, Chief Justice Waite again emphasized the right as well as the obligation of the States to protect the privileges of their citizens.

In giving the Court's opinion in the case of *United States* v. *Cruickshank* (92 U. S. 542) he said:

The fourteenth amendment prohibits a St. te from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or from denying to any person equal protection of the law, but this provision does not add anything to the rights of one citizen as against another. It simply furnishes an additional guaranty against any encroachment by the State upon the fundamental rights which belong to every citizen as a member of society.

The duty of protecting all its citizens in the enjoyment of an equality of rights was originally assumed by the States, and it remains there. The only obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. This the amendment guarantees and no more. The power of the National Government is limited to this guaranty.

The only question, then, would seem to be whether the right of voting without paying a poll tax, when the State requires such payment, is such a fundamental right as the Court referred to.

UNITED STATES *v.* REESE

The Court removed any doubt on this point in another opinion handed down in 1876, following the Cruickshank case, to which I have referred. In the case of *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214) the Court said:

The fifteenth amendment does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone. It prevents the States, or the United States, however, from giving preference in this particular to one citizen of the United States over another on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Before its adoption this could be done. It was as much within the power of a State to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race, and so forth, as it was on account of age, property, or education. Now it is not.

Please notice closely the last part of that statement. The Court said that before adoption of the fifteenth amendment a State had as much right to exclude a citizen from voting on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, as it had—and still has since passage of the amendment—to exclude on account of age, property, or education.

Plainly if the tax payment qualification is to be removed, it must be done as the color qualification was, by amending the Constitution.

I digress at that point to make another comment on the laws of New York State, where there is no poll tax, but where one must register before every election. We have permanent registration in Virginia. Once a voter is registered he remains registered so long as he remains a citizen of the State. However, I am told that in New York State a person is not permitted to vote unless he registers before every election. I am also told that more people are denied the privilege of suffrage in New York City alone because of this registration requirement than are denied the right of suffrage because of the poll-tax requirement in any one of the Southern States.

I am also told that in order to register in New York one must pass a literacy test which is equivalent to a seventh-grade education. Suppose we were to apply that New York test to Virginia, Mississippi, and Florida. I do not like to make public confession of this, because in the district which I formerly represented in the House, known as the Shenandoah Valley, there are a great many elementary schools, high schools, preparatory schools, and colleges. As farming areas go, it is a rather prosperous section, and as people go, the people of that section are fine people, and I am very proud of them. The chief recruiting officer in that area told me 2 years ago, when I complained of the fact that the Army was taking so few boys from Virginia, that in that district 42 percent of those who volunteered were rejected because they did not have the equivalent of a seventh-grade education. I said, "Then your tests must be too exacting, and your standards must be too high. Those boys have plenty of common sense and courage. They know how to shoot, and they would make fine soldiers. The tests must be too severe." He replied, "No; the modern army has a great many newfangled scientific devices, and if the boys are not educated we cannot use them."

What would happen to us in Virginia if the New York test were applied there? The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is one of those who wants to impose this bill upon us. He signed the cloture petition. He wants to bring the bill up with one day of debate on the motion. If cloture is obtained on the motion, there will be no doubt about cloture on the main issue after the preliminary issue is disposed of. We shall be told, "You can take 1 hour. If you cannot explain the issue in that time, it is too bad, but we are going to vote. We are in the majority; and whether you like it or not, we are going to cram the bill down your throats."

There are better schools in New York because through the years we have been made to pay tribute through the nose because of a high protective tariff, and because we have been compelled to sell our products from Virginia and the rest of the South on a world market, and buy what we consume under a highly protected tariff. Other States grew rich, while we were poor. My distinguished friend from Mississippi told me yesterday that only in the last decade had Mississippi recovered from the devastating effect of the War Between the States. It is complained that we have not adequate schools. It is complained that our people are not educated. Complaint is made against the poll tax. If we were to apply the same restrictions as are applied in New York, four times as many people would be disqualified as are now disqualified because of the requirement of payment of a $1.50 poll tax as a prerequisite.

But that is not the point. The Senator from New York would not want us to say what should be the qualifications for registration in New York, in Kansas, in Oregon, or in any other State. We must not go into the question of qualifications, whether a voter has lived in the State for 6 weeks, 6 months, or a year, or whether he can pass a literacy test. Senators from other States would not want us to go into those questions, but they think it is a fine thing to enact anti-poll-tax legislation. There are now only seven States which have a poll-tax requirement.

I have run through the interpretations as to the meaning of the language of section 2 of article I. It is proposed to ignore all the decisions of the courts as to what that language means, and force down our throats something which Senators from other States think we ought to have, regardless of whether we agree with them or not. I am not through with the court decisions on that point.

EX PARTE YARBROUGH

We come next to 1884 and a case styled *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651). The unanimous opinion in this case was written by Mr. Justice Miller, the same distinguished jurist who wrote the opinion in the Slaughter House cases from which I previously quoted. This is a leading case which has been cited and relied upon by the courts in later cases involving the right to vote.

In this case Yarbrough and others were prosecuted for interfering with the exercise of the right to vote by certain qualified voters in an election of a Member of Congress from Georgia. They were charged with making violent attacks on those persons to prevent their voting. Yarbrough and the other defendants claimed they were not subject to Federal prosecution because the right to vote was conferred by the State.

In its opinion the Court said:

The States, in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State.

If that language does not mean what it says, I hope my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who I understand will follow me and undertake to

uphold the right of the Congress to legislate, will tell me what the language means. In order to be sure that he has it well fixed in his mind, I shall read it again:

> They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State.

I continue to read:

> It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress. It is not true, therefore, that electors for Members of Congress owe their right to vote to the State in any sense which makes the exercise of the right to depend exclusively on the law of the State.

In short, in the Yarbrough case the Court held that the State may not prescribe qualifications for Members of Congress as such, but it does automatically determine what their qualifications shall be when it fixes the qualifications for electors of the popular branch of its own legislature. It is therefore clear that until the present Constitution be amended, the Federal Government cannot in effect fix qualifications for electors for State legislatures by prescribing qualifications of those eligible to vote in national elections. Of course that is what it would amount to, and certainly under the Constitution the qualifications have to be the same. No one, either here or anywhere else, has ever challenged that fact.

Putting the matter another way, we might say that the right to vote comes from the State. Once the right is granted, the Federal Government becomes its protector.

SWAFFORD *v.* TEMPLETON

The case of *Swafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487) involved the question of whether a person qualified to vote under State laws, who is wrongfully denied that right, has a cause of action for damages arising under the Constitution of the United States.

In answering this question in the affirmative, the Court referred to the Yarbrough case, and interpreted that opinion in this way:

> That is to say, the ruling was that the case was equally one arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or from violation of a State law which affected the exercise of the right to vote for a Member of Congress, since the Constitution of the United States had adopted, as the qualification of electors for Members of Congress, those prescribed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State.

It will be noted that the Court says the Constitution adopts the qualifications prescribed by the State—not that Congress adopts them. And, since it is the Constitution that adopts them, Congress is without power to alter this adoption.

If that is not so, I shall listen with great interest to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who says he is going to answer me. Let him explain where the power comes from, and how he can get away from the clear decision of the *Swafford case* (185 U. S. 487).

However, I am not through with the Supreme Court cases. I shall next take up the case of Gwinn and Beal against United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor by doing so?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator advise me about how much longer he will speak? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has an adjournment resolution, which is a privileged matter. I would not wish to interrupt the Senator's speech, but I feel that if we can handle the adjournment resolution today, we really should do so.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska wishes to have a general idea of when we are going to adjourn; is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I should like to have a general idea of how long the Senator from Virginia will speak because I do not wish to break into his speech with another matter, even though it is privileged. So I should like to know the approximate length of time the Senator will speak or whether he would object to having us consider the adjournment resolution soon, after which he could continue his speech. Of course, the resolution is a privileged matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the distinguished acting majority leader give me until 5 o'clock, and then ask me how I am getting along at that time?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish the Senator to think for a moment that there is any desire to cut off his remarks in any way. I did not wish to break into his speech, of course. But inasmuch as he was about to make a new point, I wondered whether it would be possible to handle the adjournment resolution at the earliest possible time.

If the Senator from Virginia thinks he may conclude by 5 o'clock, I suggest that we wait until that time to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall do the best I can; but the distinguished acting majority leader will recall that I got started about an hour and 45 minutes after I expected to start.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; I understand. I hope the Senator will take all the time he wishes to take.

Of course, I should like very much to have the Senate dispose of the adjournment resolution today, perhaps at 5 o'clock, if the Senator from Virginia can conclude by then. If not, he will continue tomorrow, of course.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am taking some time on this matter because our friend the Senator from Oregon has asked that we put into the RECORD the points and cases on which we rely. I think it will be very helpful to do so; and then any Member of the Senate can read the cases in the speech as it appears in the RECORD, and can understand them, and then can say, if he so determines, as I think he should, "I misunderstood the situation; but now that I see what the framers of the Constitution had in mind and the basis on which the Constitution was adopted by the States, I must support my oath to uphold the Constitution, and there must not be any running out on that oath merely because someone begins to press me rather hard. Then I shall not say 'Yes, I took the oath, but I must change my oath at this time.'"

Of course, Mr. President, no Senator will go back on his oath. In other words, as my friend the Senator from Mississippi said last Thursday, this is a body of honorable men. So I wish to bring to their attention my viewpoint in regard to what is right, and then let them analyze it. God knows I think they love this country as much as I do. They want to see the principles of Jeffersonian democracy and constitutional liberty upheld. I do not have to indicate those matters to them. All I have to do is show the basis of the poll tax and the decisions of the courts and what the result would be if we unwittingly were led to say to the States, "We thought you had the right, but now you will fight for it successfully through the Supreme Court."

Mr. President, I was about to refer to the Gwinn and Beal case.

GWINN AND BEAL *v.* UNITED STATES

Again, in 1915 in the case of *Gwinn and Beal* v. *U. S.* (238 U. S. 347) Mr. Chief Justice White had this to say about the effect of the fifteenth amendment on State power (p. 362):

> Beyond doubt, the amendment does not take away from the State governments in a general sense the power over suffrage which had belonged to those governments from the beginning, and without the possession of which power the whole fabric upon which the division of State and National authority under the Constitution and the organization of both governments rest would be without support and both the authority of the Nation and the State would fall to the ground. In fact, the very command of the amendment recognizes the possession of the general power by the State, since the amendment seeks to regulate its exercise as to the particular subject with which it deals.

NEWBERRY *v.* UNITED STATES

The authority of the Federal Government to regulate elections under article I, section 4 was further defined in 1921 in the case of *Newberry* v. *U. S.* (256 U. S. 232). Mr. Justice Pitney, speaking on behalf of Justices Brandeis, Clark, and himself, in a concurring opinion, which dissented on one main point in the case, said that section 4—

> does not confer a general power to regulate elections, but only to regulate "the manner of holding" them. But this can mean nothing less than the entire mode of procedure—the essence, not merely the form of conducting elections.

And, in its majority opinion in this case, the Court said:

> We find no support in reason or authority for the argument that because the offices were created by the Constitution, Congress has some indefinite, undefined power over elections for Senators and Representatives not derived from section 4. The Government, then, of the United States, can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given, or given by necessary implication.

Thus Congress may enact laws to protect the right to vote of those who are

qualified by State law; but no power is expressly given, or given by necessary implication to say who shall be qualified to vote in the States.

BREEDLOVE *v.* SUTTLES

The first case directly involving poll taxes to come before the Supreme Court for decision was that of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277) decided in 1937. In that case the plaintiff, a citizen of Georgia, attempted to vote in a State election and also in a Federal election held at the same time for a Representative in Congress. He was refused the right to vote in either election because he had not paid his poll tax. He then sued, contending the privilege of voting for Federal officials was one to which he was entitled, unrestricted by a tax unreasonably imposed through State invasion of his rights as a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Justice Butler, in the unanimous opinion of the Court, stated:

> Payment of the tax as a prerequisite (to voting) is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. * * * Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the States' power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution. * * * To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

That is a direct quotation from the decision of the Supreme Court rendered in 1915. Arguments were had in the Senate when an effort was made to put a half-way poll-tax provision in the draft bill. The Senator from Florida said the right to vote was guaranteed by the Constitution, and that the right to vote came from the Constitution. I said, "Oh, no! The States existed before the Federal Government was created. The States gave the Federal Government all its power. It had no power other than what it received from the States. State citizenship came first. It is possible to have dual citizenship. That may exist under the Federal Government, but the right to vote arises within the State."

The Constitution says:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That applies to the election of a Federal official. Senators are now elected by direct vote of the people. The provision formerly applied to Members of the House of Representatives only. That is the thing we argued. I did not have this case before me, but I knew that was bound to be the law. I am now reading the express language of the Court.

Then, after citing four leading cases, including those of Minor versus Happersett and Ex parte Yarbrough, the Court stated:

> The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources.

UNITED STATES *v.* CLASSIC

We now come to the case of United States versus Classic. As the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, that is the case upon whose dictum the proponents of the pending bill place the most reliance. It was only a dictum. Six months after that, as the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, the Supreme Court, in the Pirtle case, involving the specific question with respect to which reliance is had on the dictum in the Classic case, denied a writ of certiorari, putting its final stamp of approval on the clear decisions all the way down, as I shall mention them when I come to them, that the Congress never had any right to pass on the qualifications of voters, that it was always left to the State. There would not have been a Constitution if that provision had not been in it.

An examination of the hearings before House and Senate committees on anti-poll-tax bills discloses that some witnesses, with greater zeal for Federal action than knowledge of the history of the Constitution and the court decisions on the qualifications of voters, have relied upon the case of *U. S.* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), decided in 1941. This case is somewhat similar to the Yarbrough case, involving prosecution of Classic and others for interfering with voters in a Louisiana primary election. The main point in the case was whether the constitutional protection applied to voters in a primary as well as to a general congressional election. The Court decided that it did.

But, the Court proceeded to cite the Yarbrough case, following the ruling in that case, in holding that the right to vote in either primary or general elections of Members of Congress was given only to persons qualified under State law to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

Mr. Justice Stone said:

> Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity with the requirements of State law, subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2 and the authority conferred on Congress by section 4, to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections of Representatives.
>
> We look then to the statutes of Louisiana here involved to ascertain the nature of the right which under the constitutional mandate they define and confer on the voter.

The Court also said in this case:

> The right of the people to choose, * * * is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right.

Then followed this paragraph, which mistakenly has been relied upon by advocates of Federal action:

> While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

In other words, the office of Representative in Congress was created by the Constitution, of course. But, the opinion still says that the States are authorized to legislate as provided by section 2, which is the only one that refers to qualifications of voters, and that this authority may be limited by the Federal authority under section 4 which covers only times, places, and manner of holding elections.

I am aware, of course, that in the cases of *Smith* v. *Allwright* (1944) (321 U. S. 649) and *Rice* v. *Elmore* (C. C. A. 4th, 1947) (165 F. (2d) 387), in which certiorari was denied in 1948 (16 L. W. 3314), the issue was raised of whether a State primary was an integral part of the State election machinery and whether denial of a right to participate in the primary was a denial of a constitutional or Federal statutory right for which redress could be sought through injunctive relief or damage.

But these cases merely emphasize the accepted fact that States may not deny the right to vote which is guaranteed by the Constitution to those who are qualified. There is nothing in either of these decisions which contradicts the position taken by the Court in other cases, that the States have the authority to determine what are the qualifications.

PIRTLE *v.* BROWN

One other case which may be mentioned is that of *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. (2d) 218). This grew out of the complaint of a citizen of Tennessee, otherwise qualified, who was refused the right to vote in a special election to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives because he had not paid his poll tax.

If there could be a more direct issue before the court than that, I do not know what it could be. That is the very issue before us now. He wanted to vote for a Member of Congress, and he had not paid his poll tax. The State officials said, "You cannot vote." The District Court found against him. The decision was affirmed unanimously by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, whose opinion followed closely the reasoning of Mr. Justice Butler in the Breedlove case.

The Supreme Court was asked to review the case, but, on October 13, 1941, the petition was denied, without any opinion or statement.

This case is highly significant because only a special election for a Member of Congress was involved, and the refusal of the Supreme Court to review it came as a great disappointment to those who had tried to discount the Breedlove case on the ground that both a State and a Federal election were involved.

As pointed out by the Senator from Mississippi last Thursday, the Supreme Court affirmed the ruling of the circuit court of appeals 6 months after it had decided the Classic case. So there was no question regarding what was involved. There was no question in the minds of those who were relying on dictum, pure and simple, and there is no question about it in this case.

As a matter of fact, in an appearance before a Senate subcommittee on behalf of a poll-tax bill which he had introduced and which was being considered at the time the case of Pirtle against Brown was pending, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] stated that this case would present an ideal test of the constitutional question, since the election was restricted to that of a congressional Representative. The patron of the bill criticized the decision which had been handed down in the circuit court, said that a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court would be sought, and confidently predicted that it would be granted and the case reversed.

That was the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, before the Supreme Court had acted. He said, "It is an ideal test case. Certainly the court is wrong. The Supreme Court will change all this. Pass my bill now," as he said to the Presiding Officer this morning, "Rule now so that the bill may be brought up. Do not wait. The country is clamoring for this action. Do not let the meaning of the language disturb you. Do not let the precedents of previous Presiding Officers disturb you. Act now and let the majority have its way. Why should a minority hold up the wishes of a majority?"

Inherent in our Government is the protection of minorities on certain vital issues, and this is one of them.

The Court, however, as has been noted, denied the writ and thus placed its stamp of approval on the ruling in the Breedlove case even when no State election was involved.

The clarity of this rule is indicated by the fact that in the annotated edition of American Law Reports (vol. 130, p. 572) in reporting the case of Pirtle against Brown this proposition is stated:

> The courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid.

That was the headline not of someone running for the House or the Senate or for the Presidency. That was the headline of an experienced syllabus writer of a large lawbook publishing firm who was engaged in putting down in black and white what he, as a lawyer and a codifier, understood the decision of the court to mean. I shall read it over again:

> The courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid.

In support of this statement the annotation cites the Breedlove case, Pirtle against Brown and State court decisions from Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The supreme courts of all those States have rendered decisions in line with this case.

I have cited an unbroken line of cases, Federal and State, all of which clearly and unanimously hold that the right to fix qualifications is vested by the Constitution in the States. It has been argued at times that the cases are not in point because Congress has not legislated on the poll tax and when it does legislate, its regulation will be paramount. How silly, since the Congress has no power except that conferred upon it by the Constitution. In this instance the power not only is not conferred, it is expressly reserved by the States in the Constitution.

The principle which must be applied was well stated by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Hodgson & Thompson* v. *Bowerbank* (1809) (5 Cranch 303) when in discussing legislation dealing with judicial power he said:

> Turn to the article of the Constitution of the United States, for the statute cannot extend jurisdiction beyond the limits of the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution familiar with the constitutions of the several States and the tax requirements they included, wrote into article I, section 2, a provision that the qualifications for electors for Members of Congress should be the same as the qualifications for the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. Thus reserving to themselves that power, the States likewise bound the Congress, as much so as if the Constitution had expressly said: "The Congress shall pass no bill concerning the qualifications of persons voting for Representatives in Congress."

That there should be no doubt, in future years, of that fact, there was written into the tenth amendment this reminder:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

CARTER *v.* CARTER COAL CO.

The limitation on the powers of Congress was defined with clarity by the Supreme Court in the case of *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238) in which the Court said:

> The general rule with regard to the respective powers of the National and the State Governments under the Constitution is not in doubt. The States were before the Constitution; and, consequently, their legislative powers antedated the Constitution. Those who framed and those who adopted that instrument meant to carve from the general mass of legislative powers, then possessed by the States, only such portions as it was thought wise to confer upon the Federal Government; and in order that there should be no uncertainty in respect to what was taken and what was left the national powers of legislation were not aggregated but enumerated—with the result that what was not embraced by the enumeration remained vested in the States without change or impairment. Thus, "when it was found necessary to establish a national government for national purposes," this Court said in *Munn* v. *Illinois* (84 U. S. 113, 124), "a part of the powers of the States and the people of the States was granted to the United States and the people of the United States. This grant operated as a further limitation upon the powers of the States, so that now the governments of the States possess all the powers of the Parliament of England, except such as have been delegated to the United States or reserved by the people." While the States are not sovereign in the true sense of that term, but only quasi sovereign, yet in respect of all powers reserved to them they are supreme—"as independent of the General Government as that Government within its sphere is independent of the States." And, since every addition to the legislative power to some extent detracts from or invades the power of the States it is of vital moment that, in order to preserve the fixed balance intended by the Constitution, the powers of the General Government be not so extended as to embrace any not within the express terms of the several grants or the implications necessary to be drawn therefrom.
>
> It is no longer open to question that the General Government, unlike the States, possesses no inherent power in respect of the internal affairs of the States and emphatically not with regard to legislation. The question in respect of the inherent power of that Government as to the external affairs of the Nation and in the field of international law is a wholly different matter which it is not necessary now to discuss.

While it may be said that the value of the case I have just cited is limited as a precedent by subsequent decisions questioning the validity of the conclusion then reached by the Court, the reasoning on the particular point we have under discussion remains valid.

This was recognized by the Court when it said as late as 1945 in the case of *Screws* v. *U. S.* (325 U. S. 91):

> The fourteenth amendment did not alter the basic relations between the States and the National Government. *United States* v. *Harris* (106 U. S. 629; in re Kemmler, 136 U. S. 436, 448): Our National Government is one of delegated powers alone.

So, it seems clear that the power to fix qualifications of voters, expressly reserved to the States by the Constitution, cannot be said to be abrogated by some implied power of Congress.

It may be said that prepayment of taxes has nothing to do with the fitness or capacity of a voter, any more than race, color, sex, or previous condition of servitude. But, if this is admitted, it only follows that the same constitutional process of amendment should be used to remove tax requirements that was used to remove racial and sex barriers.

As a matter of fact, that was the process proposed by the Republican Party platform of 1944, which stated:

> The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

I have not seen the text of the poll-tax plank of the 1948 Republican platform, but I have been told that all it says is, "We favor the abolition of the poll tax."

If the Republican Party was so firmly convinced that they had the constitutional right to eliminate the poll tax by congressional action, why in 1944 did they advocate action by constitutional amendment, and why in 1948 did they not say, "and to do it by congressional action as soon as we can get to Washington?"

If the poll tax is to be abolished, the constitutional-amendment method is the only constitutional way by which to proceed. That is the only reasonable course that can be taken by those too impatient to allow the States to settle this problem in their own way. It is the course advocated by George Washington in his Farewell Address when he said that if changes in the Constitution were considered necessary, "let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation."

Now let us take a look at the pending bill in the light of the Constitution background which I have so far developed.

The first section states that—

The requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right and privilege of voting for said national officers.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi last Thursday paid his respects to those weasel words.

I should first like to call attention to the fact that the bill is made to apply to the choice of electors for President and Vice President, in the very face of the fact that the Constitution reserves to the States the exclusive power of determining the manner in which its electors shall be chosen and confers no power whatsoever on Congress to legislate on this subject.

Section 1 of article II of the Constitution provides:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

Under this provision, States do not have to hold elections to choose Presidential electors, and in the early days of the Nation some States had their legislatures choose electors, some chose them by districts and some by other methods, although at present the accepted method is to have the choice made by ballot of the whole electorate.

M'PHERSON *v.* BLACKER

Any doubt as to the latitude given the States in making their choice is removed by examination of the language used by the Supreme Court in the case of *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 27, 35) where Mr. Chief Justice Fuller said:

The Constitution does not provide that the appointment of electors shall be by popular vote, nor that the electors shall be voted for upon a general ticket, nor that the majority of those who exercise the elective franchise can alone choose the electors. It recognizes that the people act through their representatives in the legislature, and leaves it to the legislature exclusively, to define the method of effecting the object.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller also said in his opinion in this case:

In short, the appointment and mode of appointment of electors belong exclusively to the States under the Constitution of the United States. They are, as remarked by Mr. Justice Gray *In re Green* (134 U. S. 377, 379 (33:951, 952)) "no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as the electors of Representatives in Congress." Congress is empowered to determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they are to give their votes, which is required to be the same day throughout the United States, but otherwise the power and jurisdiction of the State is exclusive, with the exception of the provisions as to the number of electors and the ineligibility of certain persons, so framed that congressional and Federal influence might be excluded.

In this case the Court also quoted, with approval, from a report of the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee made in 1874, in which it was stated that "it is no doubt competent for the legislature to authorize the governor, or the supreme court of the State, or any other agent of its will to appoint these electors."

The Court said further:

Whenever Presidential electors are appointed by popular election, then the right to vote cannot be denied or abridged without invoking the penalty (of having State representation reduced as provided in the fourteenth amendment), and so of the right to vote for Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of the State, or the members of the legislature thereof. The right to vote intended to be protected refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State. There is no color for the contention that under the amendments every male citizen of the United States has from the time of his majority a right to vote for Presidential electors.

It should be apparent, then, that even if justification could be found in the Constitution for the proposed legislation as applied to elections for Members of Congress, the same authorization could not be made to apply to the choice of electors of President and Vice President. Clearly, even the limited power given by section 4 of article I to deal with the times, places and manner of elections, cannot refer to the electors, who do not have to be chosen at an election at all, if the State should prefer some other manner of selection.

So, the ground which is attempted to be covered by this bill indicates how far the enthusiasm of its sponsors has led them astray from constitutional principles.

When the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] follows me in the debate I should like to have him discuss not only the cases I have cited concerning the interpretation of section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which provides that States shall have the right to fix the qualifications of voters, and that the only qualification required of a voter to vote for a Federal official are the qualifications required of the voter to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature, but I should like to have the Senator from Oregon discuss the provision in the bill by which it is proposed to force all the States to elect their Presidential electors in the same way. I just read to the Senate two recent decisions of the Supreme Court directly saying that the Federal Government could not move in to do such a thing. I should like to have the Senator from Oregon explain to the Senate how it is proposed to do such a thing, and how it is proposed that such action shall be made to stand up.

I now come very shortly to why I believe that, even if Congress had the power to do such a thing it would be very bad for everyone concerned if the attempt were made to exercise it.

That the departure of the authors of the bill from the intent of the framers of the Constitution is not entirely unconscious is also indicated by the clause in section 1 of the bill stating that requirement of a poll-tax payment as a prerequisite to voting—

is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors * * * within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

We have here what amounts to a confession by the authors of the bill that they cannot invade the right to fix qualifications of voters, which is so plainly given to the States by article I, section 2. So they try by a legislative declaration to remove the poll-tax requirement from the definition of the word "qualification" and then, by another declaration to brand it as "interference" with the manner of holding elections, thus bringing it under article I, section 4, where Federal authority could be asserted.

There are two questions to be considered here. First, is the poll-tax requirement such a qualification as was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution and which is permissible under article I, section 2? And second, can the Congress usurp a power which always has been conceded to belong to the courts by attempting to define and interpret the meaning of the wording of our Constitution merely to justify an extension of its own powers?

On the first point, we know that Webster defines "qualification" as "a condition precedent that must be complied with for the attainment of a status, the perfection of a right, and so forth; as the qualification of citizenship."

And "qualified voter" is defined as "one who possesses certain specific qualifiations for voting, especially as to citizenship, age, and residence, and sometimes also as to literacy and ownership of property."

I can find no merit in the argument of those who attempt to say that when the authors of our Constitution wrote in the word "qualification" they had in mind only moral or intellectual qualities which would make the citizen competent to vote intelligently.

As I previously pointed out in this discussion, the possession of property or the prepayment of taxes was a prerequisite to voting in most of the States at the time the Constitution was adopted. And, in the Federalist (No. 60) Alexander Hamilton applied the word "qualification" in this connection when he spoke of "prescribing qualifications of property, either for those who may elect or be elected." Hamilton immediately added that—

This forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government. Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, and the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon another occasion, are defined and fixed in the Constitution; and are unalterable by the legislature.

The same understanding of the term "qualifications" is evident among those who participated in the constitutional convention debates. Thus (in Elliott's Debates, vol. 5, p. 385) we find that in discussion of article I, section 2, Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved to amend by striking out "beginning with the words 'qualifications of electors'," so as to "restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders." Continuing this discussion of a property ownership requirement for voters, Mr. Wilson thought it would be difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all States. Mr. Mason observed that some of the States had "extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders," and that a power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature (Congress). James Madison was undecided whether the constitutional qualification ought to be freehold, but said the right of suffrage ought to be left to be regulated by Congress.

This interpretation of qualifications of voters has continued to be accepted to the present time. Thus in volume 29 of Corpus Juris Secundum (1941) in the article on elections there is a main heading titled "Qualifications and Disqualifications of Voters." Under this there is a subtitle "Payment of Taxes" and in this it is stated that unless required by the Constitution or statutes, payment of taxes is not a qualification for voting.

Also, in 18 American Jurisprudence—1938—in the article on elections and the subtitle "Qualifications," one of the requisites listed is "payment of taxes." In this it is stated:

> Whether the adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution had the effect of rendering women subject to a poll-tax qualification theretofore applicable to men only is a question which has been answered in the affirmative in some jurisdictions and in the negative in others.

I submit, therefore, that the Congress would be violating an elementary principle of law if it undertook, as this bill proposes to do, to enlarge its own powers by changing the meaning which the word "qualification" has achieved both by popular acceptance and judicial interpretation.

This is exactly the kind of action I believe Thomas Jefferson had in mind when he said:

> In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

The bill's assertion that what the framers of the Constitution plainly recognized as a qualification for voting is not a qualification at all, is a legally unjustified twisting of language. But the following clause which says the requirement of poll-tax payment as a prerequisite to voting is a tax upon the right and privilege of voting for national officers is simply an untruth, insofar as it applies to existing State laws.

Of course, a poll tax imposed specifically on those who sought to vote in elections of Members of Congress would be an interference and a tax on the right and privilege of voting for national officers. But no State has attempted to impose such an unconstitutional tax.

What the States have done is to impose a tax which must be paid by those who wish to vote for State officers, including the most numerous branch of the legislature. When such a tax has been imposed, the Constitution of the United States makes it, under article I, section 2, a prerequisite for voting in congressional elections. So, if there is interference, it is interference by the Federal Constitution, and insofar as the tax is indirectly imposed on those who vote for national officers, it is imposed by the Constitution.

If the sponsors of anti-poll-tax bills have a legitimate grievance, it is against the Constitution of the United States and, as I previously said, they have a known and proper course of procedure. They can propose an amendment to the Constitution.

Before we take the other course proposed by this bill, it would be well for us to recall and consider carefully the words of Andrew Jackson who said in his farewell address:

> It is well known that there have been those amongst us who wish to enlarge the powers of the general Government and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution.
>
> Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them.
>
> Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantages, or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the general Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation, and you will have, in effect, but one consolidated government.

Great old Andrew Jackson was speaking there. His voice comes down to us from long ago. Perhaps it is a voice crying in the wilderness, but in my opinion, it is a voice of warning to which we should listen. The words come to us from a wisdom gained by one closer to the founding fathers than we are. His voice warns us of the need for holding to the Constitution, and cautions us against the dangers of an overpowering central government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the men who fought the Revolution and brought our Government into being fought to overthrow the very kind of government which some would now seek to establish?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. They did absolutely. They knew the kind of government they wanted. As I have pointed out, they told us what kind of a government they fought for and what kind of a government they were forming. If we want to know what kind of government they fought for, if we want to know what kind of government they framed, all we have to do is to listen to what they have said. But, of course, if we do not have ears with which to hear and eyes with which to see, the wisdom of the ages does us no good.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the statements made by the framers of our Government make it perfectly clear that they knew what the qualifications were in the several States, and that they wanted those qualifications to be the same for Federal electors? Is it not also true that one of the main reasons they so desired was that the power might remain distributed in the hands of the people, and not be concentrated in Washington?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely; and when I get to it—I hope not too late in the evening—I shall quote from a speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt extolling that very principle of our form of government and that very means of protecting minorities from what he called the oppression of a bare majority in Congress.

UNNECESSARY

Even though no constitutional question were involved, the first section of the bill, as I already have indicated, attempts to sidestep the constitutional issue by declaring that prepayment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is not a qualification but that it is an interference with the manner of holding elections and is a tax on the right or privilege of voting.

Then, mounting the shaky platform thus erected, the bill in its second section proclaims that it shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any persons from registering or voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax.

The bill asserts that when such requirement is made it shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote. It also forbids a State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting. The third section declares that it shall be unlawful "to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office" by requiring payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering; and the fourth section would make it unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the authority of a State or a subdivision of a State, to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

In short, the bill would forbid the enforcement of any requirement that a person must pay a poll tax before he is allowed to vote in national elections.

If sustained, that would likewise outlaw the requirement of payment of a poll tax on the part of those voting for members of the lower houses of State legislatures, because the Constitution requires that the qualifications be the same.

What would be the practical effect of this and what benefit would accrue to the Nation to justify such legislation?

I have pointed out earlier in the course of this argument that at the time our Constitution was adopted most of the States restricted the electorate by requiring ownership of property or as an alternative the prepayment of taxes. Later I shall have something to say about the philosophy which led to the use of these restrictions, their gradual disappearance, and then the reappearance of poll-tax requirements, primarily in the Southern States between 1875 and 1908.

But for the moment let us see just what is the status of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in the State.

In 1920 North Carolina started the parade away from the poll-tax requirement by amending its constitution to delete a provision that before a citizen was entitled to vote he must have paid his poll tax for the previous year. That ended the poll tax in North Carolina.

In 1933 Pennsylvania struck out of its constitution the section which had required that a voter must have paid within 2 years before an election some State or county tax assessed at least 2 months and paid at least 1 month before the date of the election.

An amendment removing the poll-tax prerequisite from the Louisiana Constitution was ratified in 1934 and was reinforced in 1940 with another amendment positively asserting that "the right to vote in any election shall not be affected by any requirement for payment of poll tax or for registration in a poll book in any form."

Florida repealed its law making the poll-tax payment a prerequisite for voting in 1937, and in 1941 the legislature abolished poll taxes entirely, although the Constitution of Florida still provides authority under which the legislature can levy a tax not exceeding $1 a year and make it a prerequisite for voting.

The most recently completed action to abolish the poll-tax requirement was taken by Georgia, which in 1945 repealed the statute making the payment a prerequisite to voting.

At the present time there are only seven States in which the poll-tax prerequisite to voting applies. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

So the Congress is asked to use its legislative powers ostensibly to extend the franchise to a larger number of persons in only 7 States out of the 48.

It might be noted here that in 1937 the Arkansas Legislature submitted to the people a proposed amendment to abolish the poll-tax requirement, but it was rejected by popular vote in 1938.

Also, in 1943 the Tennessee Legislature passed two bills, one repealing the levy of a poll tax and the other repealing the statute making it a prerequisite to voting. The State supreme court held, however, that these laws were invalid because they were in conflict with the requirements of the State constitution.

It may also be noted that the Virginia Legislature completed action this year—1948—on proposed constitutional amendments which will be voted on by the people next year. These amendments not only would eliminate the poll-tax requirement from the constitution but also would insert a positive statement that—

> No person shall at any time be required to pay any tax, assessment, or fee as a prerequisite to the right to register, renew his registration, or vote.

We have, then, a clearly indicated trend to abolish the poll-tax requirement by individual State action, as shown by the fact that five States have taken such action since 1920, and in three of the remaining seven the legislatures have gone on record one or more times as favoring such action.

Under these circumstances, it seems clear that the action proposed by the bill is unnecessary.

In considering the need for such legislation, I think we are justified in observing, too, that a poll-tax prerequisite for voting is more of a fancied than an actual injustice.

The registration before voting requirement in New York State disqualifies more potential voters in New York City alone than the poll tax does in the entire State of Virginia. If the larger the vote, the better the government, why place any restriction on voting? It is neither a small poll-tax payment nor registration that results in the failure of many people to vote. It is indifference to public affairs. Vast campaign funds are spent in every election in an effort to overcome that indifference.

Historically we have seen that the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting came into use in this country as a liberal alternative to the requirement that a citizen should be a landholder or property owner. It was regarded with some distrust by some of our founding fathers who feared that the colonist who owned nothing and so had little to lose might not hesitate to vote for irresponsible officials who would bankrupt the Government. It was defended, however, by those who recognized that in an undeveloped country there were those who had not had an opportunity to acquire many worldly goods but who deserved a voice in the Government. These liberals of their day were willing to trust the right of franchise to anyone who had made even a nominal contribution to the cost of maintaining his Government.

The modern trend is to substitute an educational test for a property test, and I have no quarrel with that, so long as the action is taken by the voters of the States in a constitutional manner.

But it still may be worth while for us to remember that John Stuart Mill, the English philosopher and economist, in his Considerations on Representative Government, not only recommended a direct capitation tax as a qualification for voting, but also suggested that a voter should be able to read and write and do simple problems in arithmetic.

Also, the distinguished American jurist, Judge Thomas M. Cooley, in his work on constitutional law, published in 1880, said:

> Many of the States admit no one to the privilege of suffrage unless he is a taxpayer. * * * To require the payment of a capitation (poll) tax is no denial of suffrage; it is demanding only the preliminary performance of public duty, and may be classed, as may also presence at the polls, with registration, or the observance of any other preliminary to insure fairness and protect against fraud (p. 263).

Incidentally, Judge Cooley, writing before the Yarbrough case was decided, forecast the position taken by the Supreme Court by saying in his book:

> The Constitution of the United States confers the right to vote upon no one. That right comes to the citizens of the United States, when they possess it at all, under State laws, and as a grant of State sovereignty.

Returning to the subject of how the poll-tax qualification has been viewed in the past, we may also note that an Encyclopedia Britannica article on vote and voting—eleventh edition, volume 28, 1911—mentions such qualifications of modern suffrage systems as age, periods of residence, and ability to read and write, and then says, on page 216:

> But the most universal qualification of all is some outward visible sign of a substantial interest in the State. * * * This tangible sign of interest in the State may take the form of possession of property, however small in amount, or the payment of some amount of direct taxation.

Several years ago, when this same type of bill was before the Congress, I recalled having read a book Public Finance, by the great economist, Dr. Harley L. Lutz, of Princeton University, in which he had a chapter on the poll tax.

I wrote to Dr. Lutz and asked if he had changed his views. Under date of October 5, 1942, I received a reply in which he said:

> With respect to the poll tax, I have never been able to sympathize with the usual academic position against this tax, and I tried to make that clear in the textbook to which you refer. I am still of the opinion that a poll tax is a useful feature of a revenue system, and that it is particularly so in those States which do not have great disparities of wealth and income.
>
> I think the statistics of tax collection will bear me out in saying that there are many States in which a poll tax levied at a moderate rate will produce more revenue than either a graduated tax on so-called net income or a tax on inheritances and estates.
>
> I am in complete agreement with you as to the sinister aspects of the proposal that the Congress shall assume authority to determine voting requirements in the several States. The trend toward complete Federal domination of the States and their local subdivisions must be counteracted with all the force at our command. If we add up the various manifestations of this trend, I think we have good reason to fear for the future of our Federal system, and if we permit the federalizers to destroy the basis upon which the Federal Government rests, it is my own conviction that the bulwark of our individual liberties will be destroyed also.

I pause to remind the Senate that that statement was made by Dr. Harley L. Lutz, a former professor of economics at Princeton University, who was writing to me back in 1942, urging me to stand fast to uphold the Constitution as the bulwark of all our rights.

Mr. President, it seems to me, less logical to attack the poll tax, which denies the vote to those who are financially able to make a small annual contribution to public education, but refuse to do so, than it would be to attack the restrictions which States have placed on

paupers, who might be glad to qualify if they had the money.

As compared with the 7 Southern poll-tax States, we find 13 States which deny the right to vote to paupers. These States include Louisiana, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, from the southern group; but the list also includes Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. All those Northern States have a property test; and in those States, one who is a pauper cannot vote.

Perhaps it will be said that the man who has no money and is dependent on the State for his support should not be entrusted with the responsibility of choosing officials; but if so, is there not even better reason for denying the ballot to those who have the money but are too indifferent to meet the requirements set up by their State laws?

Then again, if we are to start a process of compelling States to allow persons to vote even if they have not met tax-payment requirements, should we not include, in addition to the seven poll-tax States, those eight States which do not now permit untaxed Indians to vote? If responsibility for payment of taxes is not, as the pending bill asserts, a "qualification" for voting, but involves an unjustified interference, then why not apply the same philosophy to the Indians, who at least should have no trouble meeting residence requirements?

In the Constitution of Idaho we find language denying the right to vote to anyone "who is a bigamist or polygamist, or is living in what is known as patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or in violation of any law of this State, or of the United States, forbidding any such crime; or who, in any manner, teaches, advises, counsels, aids, or encourages any person to enter into bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or to live in violation of any such law, or to commit any such crime; or who is a member of or contributes to the support, aid, or encouragement of any order, organization, association, corporation, or society, which teaches, advises, counsels, encourages, or aids any person to enter bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal or plural marriage, or which teaches or advises that the laws of this State prescribing rules of civil conduct are not the supreme law of the State."

There may have been a time when Utah did not approve these restrictions of suffrage in her sister State, but who is here to claim that the Congress has the power to intervene.

UNDESIRABLE

But, Mr. President, aside from being unconstitutional, unnecessary, and illogical, the proposed legislation is highly undesirable.

The fact must not be overlooked that in every one of the seven States in which poll-tax payment remains a prerequisite for voting, the requirement is imbedded in the State constitution.

To take Federal action, as proposed by this bill, before the people of the States have had a chance to change their constitutions can lead only to confusion; and it may be worse than confusion, because in Virginia, and no doubt in all of the seven States, it will be impossible to bring State legislation into conformity with national legislation on the subject prior to the November elections.

Under such circumstances, judges of elections could ignore the State law and follow the Federal statute, or could ignore the Federal statute and follow the State law, or could use their own discretion as to how the two could be successfully blended.

To conduct an election under such circumstances would be to invite a contest over the seating of any candidate certified by the States as having been duly elected.

We are not without precedent as to what can happen when State and Federal laws are not in harmony. During the War Between the States, the Congress declared vacant the seats of all Members of Congress who sided with the Confederacy. After the end of the war, the Southern States held elections and certified the results to Congress, but the Congress refused to seat those declared by their States to have been elected.

The issue was not settled until after adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments and all States had brought their State laws into conformity therewith. Clearly, therefore, if the Congress deems it wise and desirable to enter the field of prescribing the qualifications of voters, the action from a decent regard for orderly processes, as well as regard for the clear provisions of the Constitution as it now exists, must be taken by means of a constitutional amendment. That fact was clearly recognized, as I have previously pointed out, by the drafters of the Republican Party platform in 1944.

The undesirability of this legislation extends beyond the specific confusion it would immediately cause, however. An important side effect of the passage of this bill would be to arouse, in the States against which it is directed, resentment which would hamper the progress which has been made by liberal elements within those States. That is why we find editorial writers and others in the South who have played leading parts in promoting better racial relations and improving social conditions, condemning this bill and other elements of the so-called civil-rights program.

For example, Hodding Carter, the Greenville, Miss., editor who won a Pulitzer prize in 1945 for his editorials on racial tolerance, has said he wishes the seven Southern States would abolish the poll tax, as five already have done, but he is unalterably opposed to Federal action.

Mr. Carter recently said in one of his editorials that the greatest danger from the proposed program "is that an angry, frustrated and fearful South may forget that the South's 10,000,000 Negroes had nothing to do with it. As in reconstruction, they may again be the longest victims of a resentment that should be directed not against them but those outside the South who harry us. Our targets should be the political cynics and the unrealistic zealots above the Mason and Dixon's line and the unyielding reactionaries below it, who have jointly brought us to this tragic pass."

Similarly we find Bishop John M. Moore, of Dallas, Tex., who has been an outstanding leader in the Methodist Church for half a century, condemning this bill in a letter published in the Christian Century, an independent religious journal with national circulation. Bishop Moore quoted assertions that a moral issue was involved in the poll-tax question and that political rights were being denied, and then said:

> The absurdity of these statements glaringly appears in the fact that every citizen in these States, Negro and white, is invited and expected to pay the poll tax without embarrassment or objection from anyone.
>
> Payment cannot be refused by the tax collector when it is offered by any white or Negro citizen of voting age and a poll-tax receipt must be issued. The poll-tax receipt is a passport to the ballot box and cannot be refused in an election. To omit those facts leads to misrepresentation, and they are omitted, while the charges "disfranchised" and "political rights denied" and "restoration" are published.

He also said in his letter that he saw no moral issue, "although as a Methodist preacher for 60 years and as a bishop for nearly 30, moral issues have been my field. It is my opinion," Bishop Moore continued, "that the bill would never have seen daylight had only a moral issue been involved." He said further:

> The bill is out-and-out political. The purpose is plainly to win the votes of Negro citizens now in northern cities and States by conferring what they call a favor upon the Negroes in the South. Every well-informed white and Negro knows that. The leaders of both parties in the North support the bill because each wants to carry New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Detroit and their States.
>
> The anti-poll-tax bill is an indignity to many fine people. It is a meddling bill. It seeks to interfere with the historic rights and customs of seven fine American States. It reflects upon the intelligence, the moral sensibilities, the social consciousness and the political honesty of their best, most substantial and most responsible citizens. It seeks to reduce the electorate to the level of the indifferent and the incompetent. It is a low road to political power.

Those are the words of Bishop Moore, of Texas, a distinguished bishop of the Methodist Church. I was merely quoting his language. That is strong language from a churchman, and if a man like Bishop Moore could become so aroused over the implications of this bill I leave Senators to imagine the intensity of reaction on the part of less tolerant persons.

The Washington Post, as I need hardly remind the Members of the Senate, is far from a reactionary newspaper, and it has consistently urged broadening the base of our electorate.

Discussing the poll-tax question editorially on last March 29, however, the Post said this bill was "a bad piece of legislation."

The editorial further said:

> The bill owes its popularity to the fact that it seeks to bring about an overdue reform. We heartily agree with its sponsors that all taxes as prerequisites to voting should be abolished. The preferable method is action by the States. Since a few States are stubbornly holding out against abolition of this

undemocratic requirement upon voters, however, we should be delighted to see Congress propose and the States ratify an anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution.

But then the editorial said—and note this carefully, coming from a newspaper which is opposed to the poll-tax limitation in itself—the editorial said this bill "is an attempt to amend the constitutional requirements as to the qualifications of voters by act of Congress."

Of course, that is all it is. The Washington Post has correctly named it.

Continuing to discuss this angle, the editorial said:

The Constitution says in unmistakable terms that the voters entitled to choose Congressmen "in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This does not give the States power to prescribe the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress as such. It simply makes use of the various yardsticks laid down by the States to serve a Federal purpose. Since that requirement of the Constitution no longer meets with public approval, it can be changed, but surely a constitutional amendment is the proper way to effect the change.

That is the opinion of this so-called liberal newspaper in the District of Columbia.

The anti-poll-tax bill attempts to effect the desired reform by changing the meaning of words in the Constitution—an underhanded and undemocratic process.

Those are not my words, Mr. President. Those are the words of the editor of the Washington Post.

It says that the requirement of paying a poll tax before voting "shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting." If this bill were law, citizens in the poll-tax States could vote for Congressmen without payment of a poll tax. But the same citizens could not vote for members of the "most numerous branch of the State legislature." The requirement of the Constitution as to who shall vote for Congressmen would thus be clearly defeated.

Concluding, the Post editorial said it recognized that it is more difficult to pass a constitutional amendment than a simple act of Congress. "But," it said, "expediency has seldom been recognized in the United States as a valid substitute for principle. At a time when we are engaged in a world-wide struggle against short cuts to power it seems especially deplorable that the Congress should be advancing so devious a scheme to accomplish a desirable reform."

Those are the words, Mr. President, of the Washington Post editorial writer.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that no one could accuse the Washington Post of having any prejudices or predilections in the matter? Is it not true that the Post has simply weighed the matter, has gone into the law and considered it, and has come to the inevitable conclusion which the Senator just read to the Senate?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There is no escape from that conclusion, it undoubtedly is the fact.

That final statement suggests what I regard as the most serious angle of the undesirability of legislation such as this bill proposes.

It is highly dangerous in principle, because it is another step in the direction of submerging the sovereignty of the States in an overpowering central government and it opens the gates for an unlimited invasion of the powers which the Constitution carefully reserved to the States.

Thus, if the Congress can say by statute that a State cannot require prepayment of a poll tax by voters, there is no logical reason why it cannot by another statute say that the voting age shall be reduced to 18 or 16 or 12. Or it can outlaw length of residence requirements and restrictions on absentee voting. It can forbid the requirement of registration. In short, it can tamper with any or all the devices which have been used to prevent corrupt elections and to limit the voting to those who have some interest in the welfare of their government and some reasonable minimum of competence to judge between issues.

Or, conversely, the Congress could by legislation narrow rather than broaden the electorate by setting up qualifications which would limit the right of voting to a chosen few who would serve the wishes of those in office and start us on our way to a dictatorship.

Before we pass this bill I think it would be well for us to recall the statement made by Thomas Jefferson:

In every government on earth is some trace of human weakness, some germ of corruption and degeneracy, which cunning will discover, and wickedness insensibly open, cultivate, and improve. Every government degenerates when trusted to the rules of the people alone. The people themselves therefore are its only safe depositaries. And to render even them safe, their minds must be improved to a certain degree. This, indeed, is not all that is necessary, though it be essentially necessary.

We should consider also the statement of Woodrow Wilson in his book on constitutional government in the United States, that "The question of the relation of the States to the Federal Government is the cardinal question of our Constitution."

There can be no doubt but that this bill strikes at the very heart of the doctrine of States' rights. In a representative democracy the most valuable, the most precious right any State can possess is the right to control its own election laws. Take that right away and they become helpless pawns in the hands of a Federal bureaucracy.

No one man was more instrumental than George Washington in bringing the 13 States together in a Federal Union. No one realized more clearly than he that such a Union would not be self-preserving and that its future would be hazarded if concessions originally made in the interest of harmony and cooperation should later be overridden. Hence his plea in his farewell address for its preservation, just as timely now as when spoken, in his admonition:

The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.

Mark this:

To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

A little later in our history——

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

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, may I yield for a question without losing my rights on the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may yield. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the statement which the distinguished Senator has been reading. Does not the Senator agree that if this bill should be enacted and sustained by the courts it would effectively lodge in Congress the right to fix the qualifications of electors, because, if the Congress can say what is not a qualification, it can affirmatively say what is a qualification?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There can be do doubt of that. Congress could say what could be done and what could not be done. If we can take over any part of the regulations of the States dealing with the qualifications of voters, we can go to any extreme upon which the majority in Congress at the time may decide.

Mr. EASTLAND. With respect to the statement of the great John Marshall, in his decision in the Marlyland case, a decision which has rung down through the years, would not that statement, in which the great Chief Justice said that whoever was wild enough to advocate breaking down the barriers that divide the States and compounding the American people into one common mass, apply to this bill which seeks to tear away the very vitals of State sovereignty?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It all falls into the same general pattern which I have been quoting. I desire to quote at this time from Andrew Jackson, who gave similar advice in his farewell address as President. He said:

My experience in public concerns and the observations of a life somewhat advanced confirm opinions long since imbibed by me, that the destruction of our State governments or the annihilation of their control over the local concerns of the people would lead directly to revolution and anarchy and finally to despotism and military domination.

Jackson also said in this address:

We behold systematic efforts publicly made to sow the seeds of discord between different parts of the United States and to place party divisions directly upon geographical distinctions; to excite the South against the North, and the North against the South—

Think of it; in his farewell address Jackson was warning us against that.

I continue quoting from Andrew Jackson:

and to force into the controversy the most delicate and exciting topics upon which it is impossible that a large portion of the Union can ever speak without strong emotions. Appeals, too, are constantly made to sectional interests, in order to influence election of the Chief Magistrate, as if it were desired that he should favor a particular quarter of the country, instead of fulfilling the duties of his station with impartial justice to all.

This is the farewell address of Andrew Jackson. He was not talking about this Presidential campaign. He further said:

But the Constitution cannot be maintained, nor the Union preserved, in opposition to public feeling, by the mere exertion of the coercive powers confided to the General Government. The foundations must be laid in the affections of the people; in the security it gives to life, liberty, character, and property, in every quarter of the country; and in the fraternal attachments which the citizens of the several States bear to one another, as members of one political family, mutually contributing to promote the happiness of each other.

Hence the citizens of every State should studiously avoid everything calculated to wound the sensibility or offend the just pride of the people of the other States—

I repeat those words:

Hence the citizens of every State should studiously avoid everything calculated to wound the sensibility or offend the just pride of the people of the other States.

He said further:

And they should frown upon any proceedings within their own borders likely to disturb the tranquillity of their political brethren in other portions of the Union. In a country so extensive as the United States, and with pursuits so varied, the internal regulations of the several States must frequently differ from one another in important particulars; and this difference is unavoidably increased by the varying principles upon which the American Colonies were originally planted; principles which had taken deep root in their social relations before the Revolution, and, therefore, of necessity, influencing their policy since they became free and independent States. But each State has the unquestionable right to regulate its own internal concerns according to its own pleasure; and while it does not interfere with the rights of the people of other States, or the rights of the Union, every State must be the sole judge of the measures proper to secure the safety of its citizens and promote their happiness and all efforts on the part of the people of other States to cast odium upon their institutions, and all measures calculated to disturb their rights of property, or put in jeopardy their peace and internal tranquillity, are in direct opposition to the spirit in which the Union was formed and must endanger its safety.

Motives of philanthropy may be assigned for this unwarrantable interference; and weak men may persuade themselves for a moment that they are laboring in the cause of humanity, and asserting the rights of the human race; but everyone, upon sober reflections, will see that nothing but mischief can come from these improper assaults upon the feelings and rights of others. Rest assured that the men found busy in this work of discord are not worthy of your confidence and deserve your strongest reprobation.

Andrew Jackson called a spade a spade, and I continue his words:

It is well known that there have been those amongst us who wish to enlarge the powers of the General Government and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution. Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them.

Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantages, or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the General Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation, and you will have in effect, but one consolidated Government.

From the extent of our country, its diversified interests, different pursuits, and different habits, it is too obvious for argument that a single consolidated Government would be wholly inadequate to watch over and protect its interests; and every friend of our free institutions should be always prepared to maintain unimpaired and in full vigor the rights and sovereignty of the States, and to confine the action of the General Government strictly to the sphere of its appropriate duties.

Referring again to Woodrow Wilson and his ideas on constitutional government, we find him saying of the relation of the States to the Federal Government:

It is difficult to discuss so critical and fundamental a question calmly and without party heat or bias when it has come once more, as it has now, to an acute stage. Just because it lies at the heart of our constitutional system to decide it wrongly is to alter the whole structure and operation of our Government, for good or for evil, and one would wish never to see the passion of party touch it to distort it. A sobering sense of responsibility should fall upon everyone who handles it. No man should argue it this way or that for party advantage. Desire to bring the impartial truth to light must, in such a case, be the first dictate alike of true statesmanship and of true patriotism. Every man should seek to think of it and to speak of it in the true spirit of the founders of the Government and of all those who have spent their lives in the effort to confirm its just principles both in counsel and in action.

Continuing his discussion, Wilson said that—

The principle of the division of powers between State and Federal Governments is a very simple one when stated in the most general terms. It is that the legislatures of the States shall have control of all the general subject matter of law, of private rights of every kind, of local interests, and of everything that directly concerns their people as communities—free choice with regard to all matters of local regulation and development, and that Congress shall have control only of such matters as concern the peace and the commerce of the country as a whole.

He said we are apt to think of our American political system as distinguished by its central structure—its President and Congress and courts which the Constitution set up—but "as a matter of fact, it is distinguished by its local structure, by the extreme vitality of its parts. It would be an impossibility without its division of powers."

From the first—

Wilson said—

America has been a nation in the making. It has come to maturity by the stimulation of no central force or guidance, but by an aboundingly self-helping, self-sufficient energy in its parts, which severally brought themselves into existence and added themselves to the Union, pleasing first of all themselves in the framing of their laws and constitutions, not asking leave to exist and constitute themselves, but existing first and asking leave afterward, self-originated, self-constituted, self-confident, self-sustaining, veritable communities, demanding only recognition. Communities develop not by external but by internal forces. Else they do not live at all. Our Commonwealths have not come into existence by invitation, like plants in a tended garden; they have sprung up of themselves, irrepressible, a sturdy spontaneous product of the nature of men nurtured in a free air.

It is this spontaneity and variety—

He continued—

this independent and irrepressible life of its communities, that has given our system its extraordinary elasticity, which has preserved it from the paralysis which has soonor or later fallen upon every people who have looked to their central government to patronize and nurture them.

Later in the same lecture Wilson said that:

The division of powers between the States and the Federal Government effected by our Federal Constitution was the normal and natural division for this purpose. Under it the States possess all the ordinary legal choices that shape a people's life. Theirs is the whole of the ordinary field of law; the regulation of domestic relations and of the relations between employer and employee, the determination of property rights and of the validity and enforcement of contracts, the definition of crimes and their punishment, the definition of the many and subtle rights and obligations which lie outside the fields of property and contract, the establishment of the laws of incorporations and of the rules governing the conduct of every kind of business. The presumption insisted upon by the courts in every argument with regard to the powers of the Federal Government is that it has no power not explicitly granted it by the Federal Constitution or reasonably to be inferred as the natural or necessary accompaniment of the powers there indisputably conveyed to it.

Woodrow Wilson was a great teacher of history and of government. When I was a young boy in the history class I was studying Woodrow Wilson's The State, and also Bryce's American Commonwealth. From those two great writers I got the impulse to devote my life to public service. I have been a follower of Woodrow Wilson ever since, and I take pleasure in quoting him here today, because I think that next to Thomas Jefferson he has been one of the greatest expounders of democracy we have ever had. He continued in his lecture:

But the presumption with regard to the powers of the States they have always held to be of exactly the opposite kind. It is

that the States of course possess every power that Government has ever anywhere exercised, except only those powers which their own constitutions or the Constitution of the United States explicitly or by plain inference withhold. They are the ordinary governments of the country; the Federal Government is its instrument only for particular purposes.

Wilson also said:

The remedy for ill-considered legislation by the States, the remedy alike for neglect and mistake on the part of their several governments, lies not outside the States, but within them. The mistakes which they themselves correct will sink deeper into the consciousness of their people than the mistakes which Congress may rush in to correct for them, thrusting upon them what they have not learned to desire. They will either themselves learn their mistakes, by such intimate and domestic processes as will penetrate very deep and abide with them in convincing force, or else they will prove that what might have been a mistake for other States or regions of the country was no mistake for them, and the country will have been saved its wholesome variety. In no case will their failure to correct their own measures prove that the Federal Government might have forced wisdom upon them. * * *

Moral and social questions originally left to the several States for settlement can be drawn into the field of Federal authority only at the expense of the self-dependence and efficiency of the several communities of which our complex body politic is made up. Paternal morals, morals enforced by the judgment and choices of the central authority at Washington, do not and cannot create vital habits or methods of life unless sustained by local opinion and purpose, local prejudice and convenience—unless supported by local convenience and interest; and only communities capable of taking care of themselves will, taken together, constitute a nation capable of vital action and control. You cannot atrophy the parts without atrophying the whole. Deliberate adding to the powers of the Federal Government by sheer judicial authority, because the Supreme Court can no longer be withstood or contradicted in the States, both saps the legal morality upon which a sound constitutional system must rest, and deprives the Federal structure as a whole of that vitality which has given the Supreme Court itself its increase of power. It is the alchemy of decay.

Wilson concluded his lecture with the assertion that—

We are certified by all political history of the fact that centralization is not vitalization. Moralization is by life, not by statute; by the interior impulse and experience of communities, not by fostering legislation which is merely the abstraction of an experience which may belong to a nation as a whole or to many parts of it without having yet touched the thought of the rest anywhere to the quick. The object of our Federal system is to bring the understandings of constitutional government home to the people of every part of the Nation to make them part of their consciousness as they go about their daily tasks. If we cannot successfully effect its adjustments by the nice local adaptations of our older practice, we have failed as constitutional statesmen.

Coming still closer to the present time, we find the Governor of a great State who later became President of the United States having this to say on the subject of States' rights—and this is the language I told the Senate at the outset I would quote from the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He said:

As a matter of fact and law, the governing rights of the States are all those which have not been surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution or its amendments. * * * The proper relations between the Government of the United States and the governments of the separate States thereof depend entirely in their legal aspects on what powers have been voluntarily ceded to the Central Government by the States themselves. What these powers of government are is contained in our Federal Constitution either by direct language, by judicial interpretation thereof during many years, or by implication so plain as to have been recognized by the people generally.

I leave the quotation from Mr. Roosevelt a moment to remind Senators of what I said in my opening remarks. I quoted the plain language of the Constitution. I quoted the interpretation of the framers of the Constitution of that plain language. I quoted a long line of court decisions on the meaning of that plain language, decisions which have never been deviated from in a single instance. I told Senators, on the basis of all of that evidence, that Congress has no power to legislate on this subject.

I read again the admonition of our former President. Some of those who now call themselves disciples of the New Deal and followers of Franklin D. Roosevelt democracy are joining here on the Senate floor in signing the cloture petition and in their efforts to force upon us something which I have told the Senate is from every standpoint unconstitutional, unwarranted, unnecessary, and violative of States' rights. This is the language of Mr. Roosevelt:

What these powers of government are is contained in our Federal Constitution either by direct language, by judicial interpretation thereof during many years, or by implication so plain as to have been recognized by the people generally.

I continue to read the language of Mr. Roosevelt:

Fortunately for the stability of our Nation, it was already apparent (when the Constitution was adopted) that the vastness of our territory presented wide geographical and and climatic differences which gave to the States wide differences in the nature of their industry, their agriculture, and their commerce. * * * Thus, already it was clear to the framers of our Constitution that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State, and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation, such as was wholly practical in Great Britain, would inevitably result in some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself. * * *

The preservation of this home rule by the States is not a cry of jealous Commonwealths seeking their own aggrandizement at the expense of sister States.

That is Franklin D. Roosevelt speaking. He continues:

It is a fundamental necessity if we are to remain a truly united country.

The whole success of our democracy has not been that it is a democracy wherein the will of a bare majority of the total inhabitants is imposed upon the minority, but because it has been a democracy where through a division of government into units called States the rights and interests of the minority have been respected and have been given a voice in the control of our affairs. * * * To bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger.

Thus it will be seen that this home rule is a most important thing, a most vital thing, if we are to continue along the course on which we have so far progressed with such unprecedented success.

The man from whom I have been quoting is Franklin D. Roosevelt. After outlining the rights granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government in this speech he said:

As the individual is protected from possible oppression by his neighbors, so the smallest political unit—the town is in theory at least, allowed to manage its own affairs, secure from undue interference by the larger unit of the county, which in turn is protected from mischievous meddling by the State. This is what we call the doctrine of home rule, and the whole spirit and intent of the Constitution is to carry this great principle into the relations between the National Government and the governments of the States.

Let us remember that from the very beginning differences in climate, soil, conditions, habits, and modes of living in States separated by thousands of miles rendered it necessary to give the fullest individual latitude to the individual States. Remembering that the mining States of the Rockies, the fertile savannas of the South, the prairies of the West, and the rocky soil of the New England States created many problems, introduced many factors in each locality, which have no existence in others, it is obvious that almost every new or old problem of government must be solved, if it is to be solved to the satisfaction of the people of the whole country, by each State in its own way.

There are many glaring examples of where exclusive Federal control is manifestly against the scheme and intent of our Constitution. It is to me unfortunate that under a clause of our Constitution itself primarily intended for an entirely different purpose, our Federal courts have been made a refuge by those who seek to evade the mandates of the State judiciary.

That is Governor Roosevelt speaking. I continue to quote from him:

I think if we understand what I have tried to make clear tonight as to the fundamental principles on which our Government is built and what the underlying idea of the relations between individuals and States and States and the National Government should be, we can all of us reason for ourselves what should be the proper course in regard to Federal legislation on any of the questions of the day.

Thus, Mr. President, in each generation since our Constitution was adopted, warnings have been sounded of the dangers of changing it except by amendment and, in particular, of the possible consequences of upsetting the delicate balance between the States and the Federal Government, and the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches.

Because the warnings of Andrew Jackson and others were not sufficiently heeded, we found ourselves plunged into a fratricidal war. Our Nation and our constitutional government survived that conflict but only at a terrible price. And, incidentally, the States against which the pending legislation is directed still are paying installments on that price in the form of retarded economic development.

But, we have survived to the present and we know that history records no instance of an overnight destruction from within of a form of government which has existed for more than a century and a half. The process always has been slow and it has always been insidious. The leaders advocating the change have always concealed their direct purposes and the masses have accepted the change in the mistaken belief that they were going to get in the future something better than they had in the past.

Let us not be so misled now. If the poll tax has outlived its usefulness, and if the fact that certain States will not recognize that situation is sufficiently important to our national welfare, let us resort to the constitutional method of amendment.

But let us not do something which might pull a cornerstone from the base of our constitutional liberty.

Let us heed the words of Daniel Webster, speaking on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, when he said:

> Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which united national sovereignty with State rights, individual security and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art, for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill. The bill would pay to District of Columbia employees and officers, and members of the Metropolitan Police and United States Park Service, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the same increase which other Federal employees received from the bill passed during the last session. It also carries a $500 increase for all teachers.

The cost is to be paid by lending to the District $5,800,000, to be paid back at such time and in such manner as the Congress may hereafter direct. I hope that the Congress will not call upon the District of Columbia to pay back this money, because of the fact that in my opinion that amount and more should be paid to the District of Columbia to help bear the expenses of the District. If the District should be called upon to pay it back, I sincerely hope that the Congress will wait until we receive the money from the British loan, and then call upon the District of Columbia for repayment.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from South Carolina on behalf of himself and other Senators will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2920) to require payment to certain employees of the District of Columbia of the additional compensation authorized by the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina if he is about to bring up a resolution relative to adjournment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will answer the Senator from Nebraska in this way: First, I should like to make a brief statement before I submit the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the purpose of the distinguished Senator, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum? I feel that all Senators should hear the statement and be ready to vote on the resolution if it is called up. If the Senator will yield to me, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. 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	Hickenlooper	Morse
Baldwin	Hill	Murray
Barkley	Hoey	Myers
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Butler	Jenner	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cooper	Knowland	Smith
Cordon	Langer	Stennis
Donnell	Lodge	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taylor
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Feazel	McKellar	Umstead
Ferguson	McMahon	Vandenberg
Flanders	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Hayden	Moore	Young

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, the first day when the Senate was open to do business, I submitted a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress. I did so after considerable thought and consideration. In the first instance, when the President of the United States announced at the Democratic convention, in his acceptance speech, that he would call the Congress into extraordinary session, I immediately, then and there, announced to the Nation that as soon as Congress met, I would submit a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress. I did so because I was convinced, in my mind, that we could not accomplish any good results by being in session at this particular time.

The President of the United States in his message to Congress asked that two particular things be done by the Congress, as Senators will find from reading his message to the Congress; first, something about inflation; and, second, something concerning the housing shortage in America.

Let us read his message, and from it we shall find that what I have said is true:

> The urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.
>
> Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things: First, to check inflation and the rising cost of living; and, second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

The President continued for four pages to discuss those two things. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that his message was only six pages long. On the fourth page the President had this to say:

> I have called the Congress back primarily to deal with high prices and with the housing shortage. Delay on either of these items would be most dangerous. In addition, there are other important legislative measures on which delay would injure us at home or impair our world relations.
>
> I therefore recommend that the present session, without allowing anything to interfere with its vital work on legislation concerning high prices and housing, take action on certain other important measures.

It will be noticed that he did not want to interfere with certain other important measures.

> These measures can speedily be enacted now because of the amount of study already given to them by the Congress.

In my discussion before the Senate last Wednesday I called attention to the fact that I had already received information which convinced me the first thing to be taken up would be the anti-poll-tax bill. I do not have to tell Senators now that the bill is going to be brought up; it has already been brought up. It has been discussed since last Wednesday. In my opinion it will be discussed, the Lord knows how long, if we remain in session.

To realize our situation, it is necessary to be here and feel what is going on in this Chamber. Again, it is important to realize the feeling and condition of the

people back home and the different attitudes of the people of the Nation concerning the issues in order to realize why we are hopelessly deadlocked today and why we shall remain so, as long as we are taking up anti-poll-tax, antilynching, FEPC, and other bills of that nature.

Mr. President, if you would but go down to South Carolina today and converse with individuals in that State; if you would then go over to Georgia or to Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas, not to forget Arkansas, you would find, on the part of the people in all those States, a burning desire to protect themselves against any encroachment upon what they consider a right of the States.

What difference does it make about the poll tax? So far as the poll tax itself is concerned, it will not prevent any person in my State from voting, if he wants to vote. It is only $1 a year, and it is not cumulative. It does not affect the primary election but only the general election. The Supreme Court in a recent decision said that the primary in my State is everything. But we are here fighting the poll tax because we feel that it touches a right belonging only to the State and not to the Federal Government. That being so, we find Senators opposing the poll tax. They will continue to fight it. The result will be that the Nation will be torn asunder by this issue. No good will be accomplished by the discussion. Finally, if it is desired to pass other legislation, the bill will be laid aside. Why is it we do not have before us at the present time some of the bills concerning housing conditions or bills designed to control rising prices? We are not going to have those bills.

I believe the President, having been a Senator for many years, should have known what would happen in the extra session. Some say he called it because of politics. I fear the reason it was called was just that. I want to give credit where credit is due, but, having been a Senator, the President should have known that we would get into this deadlock and that we would accomplish nothing.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield only for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not wish to challenge the Senator's assumption that the session may be a futility, but since the Senator has referred to the question of inflation, and since those of us who have studied that subject the most realize that about all the Congress can do to prevent still greater inflation is to control the further expansion of credit, which is itself the equivalent of putting more money into circulation, does the Senator not think that I, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is handling that problem now, should vote to remain in session, to see whether the committee will bring out a worth-while bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I see it, nothing can be accomplished here that is worth while. I further predict that what will be reported by the committee in that field will only penalize the States that need more credit now. I mean by that that whatever measure is reported will be crippling and damaging to those who really need relief, and will thereby hurt certain sections of the Nation. It will be found that, where banking facilities are great, control will be exercised over everything. I ask Senators to take note of that prediction. For that reason, I do not believe any good can come from curtailing credit, which is the only suggestion that has been made.

Since last Wednesday what have we done? We have done nothing but discuss certain subjects which the people do not understand. They think we ought to lay the pending question aside, take up the necessary legislation, and return home. The President has said that within 2 weeks we ought to do the job. Senators know that legislation passed by the Senate of the United States is far-reaching. To pass price-control legislation would take more than 2 weeks. Consider the housing situation. We have had that question before us during the last year, and we did not pass the legislation in 2 weeks. It is now bottled up. Something should be done to relieve the housing situation, but we are between the Republican Convention, the Democratic Convention, and the election in November. Did Senators come to the Senate because they played politics? Is the President of the United States to receive any votes because he plays politics? We may as well face that question. The two parties are playing for position at the present time. We might as well face it and be done with it. This is no time for representatives of any nation to be called into session. There is discontent between the two great parties of our Nation. As I said in my speech last Wednesday, it might cause such a rift between the Democrats and the Republicans that no longer would we have any bipartisan program, so far as our foreign relations and affairs are concerned. It might tear us asunder, and probably, because of such feeling in the United States, it will cause to exist a Federal bed in which communism may sprout and grow. Causing a rift between the two great parties would jeopardize permanent peace and might sprout and grow into a third world war.

Mr. President, I still feel that to be true. That being so, I have a resolution asking for the adjournment of this Congress on Wednesday, the 4th of August, 1948. The reason why I have made the date Wednesday, August 4, 1948, is because the House has already recessed and will not meet until next Wednesday. The House could not act upon it before that time. If the Senate will recall, when I submitted my resolution it was to be taken up on Friday or Saturday, but the House of Representatives recessed on Thursday to return on Monday, today. Therefore, it was impossible to consider it on Friday. Another reason I made the date July 31 in the beginning was that, in my opinion, we already have a law which adjourns the Congress on the 31st of July. We passed a law known as the Reorganization Act in 1946. It was passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President of the United States. Let me read section 132 of that law:

> Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

No national emergency has been proclaimed by the President. The President knew that that law was on the statute books when he called us into session on the 26th day of July. The law was signed by him. Congress went into session on the 26th day of July. If Congress wants to remain in session, in my opinion, it should pass a resolution continuing the session. The Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Presiding Officer of the House have a right to call Congress back into session, according to the terms of our adjournment in June.

There is a serious question in my mind as to whether or not we have been legally in session after last Saturday. This is the first time the adjournment resolution has been called up.

Mr. President, I send to the desk my resolution, asking for only a slight modification by inserting "Wednesday, August 4" in place of "Saturday, July 31, 1948." I ask consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 60), as follows:

> That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, August 4, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.
>
> SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is not subject to debate.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the chief clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JENNER (when his name was called). I have a pair with my colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is detained from the Senate on official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is necessarily absent on important public business. Prior to his departure, he arranged a live pair on this vote with the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. The senior Senator from California had expected to be

present to announce his pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee, but is unavoidably detained. In his absence I desire to state that if present and voting, the senior Senator from California would vote "nay" and the junior Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from South Dakota would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent, attending the funeral services of a close friend.

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—13

Byrd	Hill	Maybank
Eastland	Holland	Russell
Feazel	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	
George	McKellar	

NAYS—58

Aiken	Hoey	Pepper
Baldwin	Ives	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Butler	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McGrath	Thye
Donnell	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Flanders	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—25

Ball	Hatch	Sparkman
Brewster	Hawkes	Stewart
Bricker	Jenner	Tobey
Buck	Lucas	Tydings
Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Capehart	Malone	White
Chavez	O'Conor	Wilson
Downey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	Reed	

So the concurrent resolution was rejected.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the unfinished business, Senate bill 2644. The amendment is the anti-poll-tax bill, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

FIRST 1949 PRODUCTION GOAL RECOMMENDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the release from the United States Department of Agriculture respecting 1949 production goals. I call attention especially to the recommendation that the number of head of beef cows on farms and ranges be reduced by half a million head below the number on farms the 1st of last January.

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

FIRST 1949 PRODUCTION GOALS RECOMMENDED BY UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

National goals for 1949 production of several important farm commodities, including a wheat-acreage-goal, while somewhat below this year's planted acreage, would at recent yields produce another crop of more than a billion bushels, are being recommended to States by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Other national goals suggested at this time are for rye, winter cover crop seeds, winter vegetables, dry edible peas, and beef cattle. The beef goal calls for careful culling of cattle numbers by January 1 in order to maintain healthy, well-balanced herds while increasing meat supplies in the months ahead.

These recommendations are being submitted to the State United States Department of Agriculture councils for local consideration and possible adjustment within the national pattern. State goals and final national goals will be announced later, following State review and recommendations.

Wheat: The suggested goal for wheat is 71,500,000 planted acres, about 8 percent less than estimates of this year's seeded acreage. With an average yield of approximately 15 bushels per acre, the 1938–47 average, production in 1949 would total 1,100,000,000 bushels. This would be in line with estimated domestic, export, and carry-over needs.

The goal seeks to bring about adjustments in areas of relatively low productivity without materially affecting total production. United States wheat acreage has increased markedly during recent years in response to war and relief needs. If farmers are to make the best use of the country's soil resources, however, a somewhat smaller acreage should be planted. Moreover, a better balance between soil-conserving and soil-depleting crops will actually assure higher productivity over a long period of years. Farmers are urged to provide for sufficient summer fallow and, in marginal areas, to begin reseeding to grass land which is not suited for sustained production of crops. The recommended wheat-acreage goal for 1949 would provide the opportunity for farmers to start the shift back to these better conservation practices.

Other considerations in arriving at the wheat goal were this year's increased carryover, prospects that the 1948 crop will be the second largest in history, and the possibility of smaller foreign demands because of improved crops in many importing countries. It is also pointed out that the wheat carryover next year may be even larger. Failure of Congress to ratify the proposed International Wheat Agreement, which would have guaranteed a substantial export market for United States wheat for 5 years, has cast doubt on our ability to maintain high-level production and exports.

Rye: The suggested goal for rye is 2,500,000 acres for harvest in 1949. This would be about 313,000 acres more than the indicated acreage this year. With average yields, production next year would be about 30,000,000 bushels. Competition from other crops for available land has caused a downward trend in the harvest acreage of rye for a number of years, but indications are that more rye would be used if larger supplies were available.

Beef cattle: The Department recommends a beef-cattle breeding-herd goal which would maintain not less than 15,500,000 head of beef cows on farms and ranches on next January 1. Achieving this goal would result in a further moderate decrease of about one-half million head below the number on farms last January 1. Better management, improved feeding practices and thorough culling are urged to put the cattle industry in better position to supply the meat requirements of an increasing population.

A slaughter goal of 32,000,000 head of all cattle and calves, for the year July 1948–June 1949 is recommended—in line with the beef cattle-breeding goal and the expected volume of cattle feeding. While this recommended slaughter would mean a further small decrease in breeding-herd numbers, it would provide a larger quantity of beef and veal than would be available if cattle numbers were held at present levels or increased. These beef and veal supplies will be needed in the months ahead, with pork production expected to be less than in the previous year and with meat demand expected to continue abnormally strong. The recommended slaughter would be about 7 percent less than the number of animals slaughtered in each of the last two similar 12-month periods, with feeding to heavier weights probably offsetting this to some extent. The goal is regarded as the most practicable one in view of the various factors which must be considered.

Winter cover crops: Harvested acreage and production goals for winter cover-crop seeds are: Austrian winter peas, 74,000 acres, 80,000,000 pounds; crimson clover, 108,000 acres, 25,000,000 pounds; hairy vetch, 129,000 acres, 30,000,000 pounds; common and willamette vetch, 103,000 acres, 50,000,000 pounds; common rye grass, 98,000 acres, 43,000,000 pounds; blue lupine, 57,000 acres, 50,000,000 pounds.

Goals represent substantial increases in production of all the seeds except rye grass. Stocks of all the others are at very low levels, and the 1948 crops are not expected to provide adequately for domestic requirements and exports. Increased production of the seeds is badly needed to restore the fertility of heavily cropped soil and to meet export demands, only partially filled in recent years.

Winter vegetables: Acreage guides for 1949 production of 15 winter vegetable crops total 281,750 acres. With average yields, this acreage would result in a production about equal to that of 1948, although it would be 3 percent less than the acreage available for harvest in 1948. Recommendations include harvested acreage increases of 5 percent for carrots and 20 percent for peppers. Suggested acreage reductions are: 10 percent for snap beans and celery: 15 percent for escarole; 5 percent for cabbage and lettuce; and 3 percent for shallots. No changes are recommended for lima beans, beets, cauliflower, kale, green peas, spinach, and tomatoes.

Dry edible peas: The recommended goal is 225,000 acres of dry edible smooth peas,

which, with normal plantings of wrinkled peas, would total 350,000 acres. With average yields, this acreage would produce about 2,500,000 100-pound bags of smooth peas. Foreign demand has slowed noticeably during the past year. Production areas are primarily in Idaho, Colorado, and Washington, with smaller acreages in California, Michigan, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, and Oregon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment on the insertion made in the RECORD by the Senator from Ohio. The release of the Department of Agriculture covered many commodities, including hogs, cattle, wheat, poultry, and other items. In most all of them the goal set by the Department of Agriculture represented an increase in production. We all know that the hog population at this time is below what it has ever been, or that it approximates the low ebb in the production of hogs, due largely to the shortage in the corn crop upon which hogs are fed.

It is true that the high price of cattle has induced many farmers to sell their dairy cattle, and to sell also their cows which have been used for breeding purposes, and that is a perfectly natural reaction to high prices in the field of cattle. It has been desirable and no doubt is desirable that the breeding type of cattle be preserved as much as possible on the farm because it takes from 2 to 2½ years to produce beef cattle which are marketable, unless sold as veal. So that in the goal set by the Department for cattle the question of undertaking to stabilize the production of cattle through the breeding process, which is the only way to stabilize it, has been taken into consideration in the goal set by the Department.

In the case of hogs, the Department has recommended that there be an increase of 10 percent in the hog population of the country because there is a large crop of corn this year upon which to feed them, and therefore it would be justified, and that increase in the production of hogs and the consequent increase in the production of pork would offset any apparent decrease in the production of beef cattle due to the reasons which I have suggested.

I wanted to make that comment because I think it ought to be done in explanation of at least some of the goals set by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, following my statement subsequent to the insertion by the Senator from Ohio of a release from the Department of Agriculture in regard to cattle, I wish to insert a brief memorandum with respect to various articles, including grains, livestock, poultry, dairy products, and winter vegetables.

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

AGRICULTURAL GOALS

The Department of Agriculture's goals constitute recommendations to farmers on the basis of which they can plan their coming year's crop operation. They are advisory to and not mandatory on farmers.

The guiding principle in formulating goals for 1949 was to start toward a postwar readjustment. It is directly related to the recent price-support legislation which contemplates lower support price on many commodities in the coming years.

GRAINS

Wheat: In the case of wheat, acreage goals contemplate some smaller demand upon American grain supplies resulting from the increased production capacities of European nations. Specifically, it is designed to encourage withdrawal from production of the marginal producing lands upon which we have placed such a serious strain in our efforts to reach maximum production of all types of grain during the world food crisis. But our goal still calls for a production at average yields of about 1,100,000 bushels—a high figure compared with most years in the past.

Rye: The Department recommended a 313,000-acre increase in rye.

Grass and cover crop seeds: It recommended substantial increases in the production of all grasses and cover-crop seeds.

ALL MEATS

Hogs: On March 15 the Department urged farmers to increase their production of fall pigs by at least 10 percent more if possible. This was reemphasized in a special plea on July 20. This request is based on the excellent prospect for a substantial corn and feed crop.

Beef: The Department's recommendations for the coming year are designed to indicate to farmers and ranchers the need for stabilizing the number of breeding cattle. The aim is to keep slaughter at a reasonably high level, while at the same time preparing the way for a swing back toward larger breeding herds and larger meat supplies for the future. The Department is also urging farmers and ranchers to take advantage of the good feed crops now in sight and feed to heavier weights in order to produce as much as possible from the numbers on hand.

Poultry: The Department now contemplates a request to farmers for an increase in poultry on farms for the coming year. This increase is justified by the anticipated expanded supplies of grain and poultry feed. The increase is also necessary to help maintain the levels of supply of meat and poultry at as high a level as possible in relation to the active demand.

Dairy: With respect to dairy, the Department has steadily encouraged farmers to maximize dairy production and will surely ask for as large an increase next year as dairy cow numbers will warrant—which is another reason for wanting to stabilize cattle numbers.

WINTER VEGETABLES

It recommended a production of approximately the same as for 1948 although expecting to reach that production with 3 percent less number of acres.

The production of dry edible peas was reduced because of the noticeable slowing down of demand. The production will be still well above prewar level.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Nebraska has kindly consented to permit me to speak for a minute or two to express a protest against the motion I understand the acting majority leader is about to make, namely, a motion to recess or adjourn until tomorrow at noon.

I appreciate that one lone voice in the Senate in opposition to a motion to recess is not going to have much effect, but I call the attention of the Senate to an opinion of mine that there are millions of people throughout the Nation who I think will share the protest I here now make about any adjournment without a night session, because I think that a great majority of the people of the United States believe that in this extraordinary emergency session of the Congress we should stay here and do the people's business.

I want the RECORD to show that I shall continue to protest these recesses at 6 o'clock, or 6:10, or any similar hour, so long as this special session continues, because I think the Republican majority should make very clear to the Democrats that we are here to do the people's business, and that we intend to hold the Senate in session each night until 11 p. m., until we transact the people's business. In view of what is perfectly obvious to us as the Democratic strategy in this session, I do not think the Republican majority can justify recessing at least before 11 p. m. each day, in its endeavor to move as rapidly as possible to transact the business which should be transacted in this special session of the Congress.

I am perfectly willing to admit that most of the speeches we have heard on the pending motion, namely, the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill, have been speeches, up until this hour, which have been on the merits of the bill itself, and, in my judgment, they have been exceedingly able speeches. However, each and every one of them could have been made on the merits of the anti-poll-tax bill itself once we took it up. In my opinion that is when they should be delivered, rather than upon a motion to determine whether or not we should even take up for consideration the anti-poll-tax bill.

As one lone Senator on this side of the aisle, I respectfully recommend and suggest to the leadership of my party on this side of the aisle that I think the time has come when clear notice should be given to the Democratic side of the aisle that from now on until this special session adjourns we intend to hold the Senate in session every evening until such time as it becomes clearly demonstrated that it would probably be more appropriate to proceed even with 24-hour sessions, Mr. President, so that we can transact the people's business at this session of the Congress.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to associate myself in toto with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. We are now in the second week of a special session of the Congress. Not only the Senate but the country is entitled to know something of what

the program before the special session is to be. I wanted to interrogate the acting majority leader, and the chairmen of committees who are upon the floor, so that we might be informed about what is in store for the Senate.

The first matter the President recommended dealt with high prices. May I ask the acting majority leader, or the chairman of the appropriate committee if I am correct in assuming that hearings are now being held on that proposed legislation, or at least that the subject is being considered by the proper committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe that a statement to that effect was made about as forcefully and clearly as could be made when we started the session. I know the statement I made included the fact that one piece of legislation that was recommended by the President was the so-called civil-rights legislation, and that the only legislation ready for immediate debate was one of the civil-rights bills which are now on the calendar, and that one of them would be taken up—until when? Until committees of the Senate had properly processed and reported to the Senate legislation on other subjects. I said that whenever one of the committees reports back favorably to the Senate a bill dealing with any of the proposals submitted by the President, and it came to the calendar, then we would be ready for debate. As I understand, the committees have not yet reported any legislation relative to the first category, and we are still on the civil-rights measure which was contained in the second category the President recommended.

Hearings are being held by committees. I understand that Mr. Porter, who is one of the witnesses for the administration on the so-called anti-inflation measure, appeared before a House committee. He also appeared today before the Senate committee. Other witnesses will be called, and when and if legislation is finally reported favorably it will be ready for consideration. In the meantime we expect to continue the debate on the bill, the consideration of which has been moved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I understand correctly, then hearings are being held before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the question of high prices?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. And hearings are also being held in the House.

Mr. PEPPER. The second question raised by the President relates to housing. I wish the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would not leave the floor, because I am going to ask whether or not the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, expects to call any committee meeting to deal with the minimum-wage law and possibly some of the other legislation the President has recommended? At least that is one subject within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I have no intention of doing so at the present time.

Mr. PEPPER. So then we have the statement from the policy leader of the Republican side, who is also the chairman of the committee, that although there are pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare several different bills relating to the minimum wage, there is not even to be a committee meeting to consider the subject while this special session is in progress. That is the kind of clarity I wanted to get on all these subjects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has answered the questions propounded by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say relative to housing that legislation respecting it has been considered and no doubt will be considered. Whether it will be reported favorably I cannot say.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is a committee considering at this special session of the Senate any further legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to supplement my statement by saying that the Senate passed the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and that measure is now in the House. The legislation to which I had reference has to do with some corrective matters upon which I understood some evidence was being adduced.

Mr. PEPPER. There is no further consideration by any Senate committee, then, being given to legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is a member of the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should merely like to say for the information of the Senator from Florida and of the Senate that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, of which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is chairman, is and has been meeting since Wednesday of last week twice daily. The subject of what further might be done in the field of housing legislation is being seriously considered by that committee, bearing in mind that the Senate itself passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill during the last session of the Congress.

In this connection, I should like to point out that one of the difficulties confronting us is that Mr. Eccles, who for 13 years has been charged with watching inflationary trends in this country, Mr. Paul Porter, who is presently the coordinator for the administration, and Mr. Snyder, who is the Secretary of the Treasury, have all, but in different degrees, called to our attention the inflationary threat involved in the proposed passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Your committee, consisting of both Democrats and Republicans, is endeavoring to determine from those qualified and conscientious witnesses to what degree the bill in question is conducive to further inflation, and whether or not the threat of such inflation offsets the virtues included in the legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. That is the kind of information I wanted to get.

Mr. CAIN. It is the hope of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, that by the end of this week an affirmative position will be taken in the field of housing and on the price question.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. WHERRY. I intended to make a motion to recess.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we have already cleared up several questions. I simply wish to run briefly through the seven or eight recommendations of the President. I should like to know whether or not any Senate committee is giving consideration to these subjects. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has clarified the matter by saying that he is not going to call his committee together, and that no minimum-wage proposal is to be recommended to the Senate.

I should also like to know about social security. Is the Committee on Finance considering the President's recommendations with respect to social-security legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall make a final answer to the Senator's questions, in the light of the statement which I made on Friday night. So far as I am concerned, this Congress will remain in session so long as any constructive legislation on any of the President's proposals might come from the committees for consideration by the United States Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall conclude by saying that the next question relates to displaced-persons legislation. I do not know whether any committee is considering that point, but that is one of the recommendations of the President.

The next question is the wheat agreement. That was recommended in the form of a treaty. I do not know whether the Foreign Relations Committee——

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the Senator a member of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I am not a member. I do not know whether the Foreign Relations Committee is considering the question or not.

Another question is the TVA appropriation, to build stand-by power plants. I do not know whether the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is considering that question or not, but I am trying to find out.

Another subject is the Federal pay bill. I do not know whether or not any Senate committee is considering the President's recommendation in that connection.

I thought we were entitled to know what progress, if any, was being made. Of course, the last item is the civil rights program. I believe that in due course we should be advised as to what action is being taken or is contemplated.

I thank the Senator for helping to the extent that he has helped me.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. With regard to social-security legislation, I introduced a bill last week on that subject, which was referred to the Finance Committee. The Chairman of the Finance Commit-

tee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], has announced that there will be no action by that committee on that subject at this session.

Mr. PEPPER. That clarifies two of the points.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am sure that these points will be clarified as we proceed with the work of the Senate. Let me say again that so far as I am personally concerned, any legislation which is processed through the committees and receives their favorable consideration will be brought up on the floor of the Senate for discussion.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that that committee is now considering, and has been considering, the wheat agreement. We held a session yesterday. We are to have another tomorrow. There appeared before us the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of the State Department. That problem is receiving the best possible attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I think it is generally known that I am opposed to discrimination in any form. I wish to protest against the way in which estimable Senators from the South are being discriminated against in the United States Senate. They wish to be heard on the question of bringing up the anti-poll-tax bill, and I believe that they are deserving of the same honor which I recently received when I wished to express my views on the draft. The Senate remained in session continuously to listen to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself. I should say that we were a team. I do not wish to say that either of us was the leader. I do not desire to take more credit than I give to the Senator from North Dakota. But certainly if the Senate can honor two Senators in that way, it should pay the same respect to a greater number of our colleagues, who happen to come from below the Mason and Dixon's line.

So, Mr. President, I believe that the proposal of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the Senate remain in session until 11 o'clock is utterly inadequate. It would be a reflection upon the oratorical ability of other Senators for us to adjourn at 11 o'clock. I am firmly convinced that the Senate should remain in session continuously until those Senators have had an opportunity to be heard, as I had an opportunity to be heard, without interruption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that the President of the United States will send to the special session of Congress a recommendation that, with respect to western power and reclamation projects and transmission lines, the budget cuts of the last session be restored. I ask the Senator from Nebraska, who is the able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with these matters, whether or not, if such a request is submitted, he will suggest that the Appropriations Committee hold a hearing on the subject?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer the Senator from Washington with the observation that I believe that recommendations with respect to such projects have already been submitted to both the House and Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had no knowledge of that fact.

Mr. WHERRY. They are now being considered by the House.

A little earlier I made the statement that if any new evidence were submitted that warranted opening up any of these recommendations, I felt that our committee, if and when the House sent the bill over, would give it consideration. The appropriations must first be processed in the House. I believe that my statement is a very fair one, and I believe the Senator from Washington will agree that appropriations for such projects will be given consideration if and when they come from the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

NIGHT SESSIONS—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it has been the practice not to hold night sessions until the Senate has been notified of them. For that reason it is not contemplated to have a night session tonight for any purpose. When and if we contemplate night sessions, announcement will be made so that Senators will know what the program is.

Mr. President, the majority party is doing everything within its power in this short space of time to consider the program suggested by the President. Senators may have our assurance that if and when constructive legislation is favorably reported from committees it will be considered. I hope that the questions which have been asked this evening will be clarified, and that we can proceed on that basis.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 2 (legislative day of July 28), 1948:

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the Displaced Persons Commission for terms ending June 30, 1951:

Ugo Carusi, of Vermont.
Edward M. O'Connor, of New York.
Harry N. Rosenfield, of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece.

H. Lawrence Groves, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Frederick J. Cunningham, of Massachusetts.
Harrison Lewis, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.
Charles Gilbert, of New York.
Don A. Gribble, of Vermont, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

James R. Riddle, of Alabama.
Ernest V. Polutnik, of Montana.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from January 1, 1947:

Donald E. Ullery

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal and everlasting Father, grant unto us Thy holy guidance as at this noon hour we turn our minds and wills toward the vital matters of our national life.

We ask Thy blessing on each and every Member of this House of Congress, for they have grave responsibilities. Give them courage to face their problems and wisdom to help solve them in the best possible manner. May they put their trust in Thee, as our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. They committed their ways and hopes unto Thee, and Thou didst lead them to victory and to triumph.

So today we commit ourselves unto Thee and pray for victory in the cause of righteousness and truth. May we be faithful doers of Thy will today and every day, and thus may we help to build Thy kingdom.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 29, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2482. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Central Intelligence Agency.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
8. Office of Selective Service Records.

SUSPENSIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to respond generally to an inquiry that a number of Members have addressed to me. They have asked me whether or not any suspensions will be called today. I now announce that there will be no suspensions today.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on House Joint Resolution 212.

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

There was no objection.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the people want something done about the ever-mounting prices for food and other necessities. The people want an end to the inflationary spiral of the cost of living.

If the present high cost of living is due to shipping our surplus farm products and other necessities out of this country to foreign lands, then let us do something to curb the excessive exports so that the supply at home will exceed the demand and thus bring prices down.

If inflation of our national debt and the currency has brought about high prices and is now blowing the top off the National Treasury, then let us do something to stop the inflation of our national debt and our currency.

If bank credits should be restrained to bring prices down, then let us do something to restrain those credits.

If Government departments and agencies are competing with private industry to boost prices for food, clothing, and other necessities higher and higher, then by all means let us pass legislation to stop all further invasion of private industry by Government departments and agencies.

With the price of wheat and corn and meat going higher and higher in the market place because of greater and greater scarcities of these products, let us stop the Agriculture Department from advocating the planting of less wheat and raising less cattle, such as they advocate in their release of July 23, 1948.

And whatever we do, let us stop trying to pass legislation at this special session that the other body in the other end of the Capitol can talk to death.

If the administration is sincere about restoration of consumer credit controls, regulation of inflationary bank credit, and control of speculation on the commodity exchanges, why was not Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System Board of Governors, ready to testify on these subjects and controls before the Senate and House Banking Committees a week ago? When Mr. McCabe was asked to testify before these committees, he is reported to have told the committees that he could not possibly be ready to testify for another week.

If the administration is sincere about restoration of such controls to curb the inflationary spiral and reduce prices, why was not the Secretary of the Treasury ready to testify before these committees a week ago? Instead, Secretary Snyder is reported to have said, when asked to testify last week before the proper congressional committees, that he would not be prepared to testify until after Mr. McCabe made his appearance before the committees.

If the President has emergency powers to reimpose controls over consumer credit to be exercised by the Federal Reserve System, let us spell it out for him and demand that he exercise his powers in that respect.

But let us not adjourn this special session of Congress until we have done something to curb the inflationary spiral and to stop these ever-increasing prices that are a plague on the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and two tables.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Independence (Kans.) Daily Reporter.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. SCRIVNER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous material.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MATHEWS) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an extract from a news letter and a short bill she is introducing today.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sunday Star.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

VETERANS' FLIGHT TRAINING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from evidence presented by the operators of flight training schools in my district that the administration of veter-

ans' flight training is not functioning as was intended by the Congress.

It seems to me that the proposed screening of applicants is more severe than was intended, but even more serious than this is the fact that through administrative methods applications are piling up without action either pro or con thereon. The largest schools in my district have succeeded in getting approximately only one student each accepted during the past 2 months. Efforts should be made to correct this situation without delay as schools in my area face either voluntary closing down or bankruptcy if this situation is to continue. I quote here some telegrams covering this subject, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your cooperation in protesting the perversive prejudice shown by Veterans' Administration against flight-training applicants, namely, in interviews and screening, will be deeply appreciated.

ALBERT A. GABARDI.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *July 30, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request that you investigate arbitrary curtailment of veterans' flight training by Veterans' Administration. Students who now apply for flight training are receiving rejection forms from Veterans' Administration, which read: "Flight training is considered avocational and recreational."

MERTON B. HASKELL,
Haskell Flying Service.

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congress should act at once to force the VA's hand to act on pending applications for flight training. My affairs have been tied up for 5 weeks awaiting their decision. Neither do they have any procedure for me to use in following up my case.

ROY GEORGE EKER.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DOWNEY, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Is there anything you can do to promote congressional action which will cause the VA to formulate a policy and act upon my application for schooling under Public Law 346? I filed month ago for flying training. No response pro or con. Imperative I know real soon.

E. C. FLORES.
LONG BEACH, CALIF.

ANAHEIM, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Imperative you protest to the Veterans' Administration of their arbitrary attitude in screening flight applicants. Very low percentage being approved. Your immediate attention to this matter imperative.

GEORGE F. OWNS,
Cypress School of Aeronautics.

NORWALK, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is important that something be done to bring about action from the VA in approving or disapproving flying-school applicants who apply under Public Law 346. They have no policy for screening. They have no instructions for procedure for either the school or the applicant. Their voluntary delay is costly to all involved. Veterans who acted on school's solicitations are demanding reimbursement from school for $10 physical-examination fees which VA required before their applications were filed.

SOUTHERN CAL FLYERS,
Cranford Airport.

LIBERALISM

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, when a voter takes other people's money to vote for a political candidate it is a crime called bribery, but when he votes for a candidate because that candidate promises to take other people's money and give it to him after the election, that is a virtue called liberalism. Why is this?

RESERVE REQUIREMENTS OF BANKS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the leadership of the two bodies will do with respect to the request as it has been submitted to raise the reserve requirements of the banks, but we can well afford to give that some thought before we vote in favor of it, provided it is recommended. If reserve requirements are raised, the banks can call loans to get the necessary money or they can sell Governments bonds. My guess is that they will sell Government bonds by the billions, and let loans ride as long as possible and produce higher income than from bonds. The Federal Reserve will have to support the bond market, and as it buys those bonds it increases the reserves of the banks. The banks can move into a position to make further inflationary loans. That is something we had better think about before we vote in favor of the single proposition of increasing reserve requirements of the member banks.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am telling the people in my district that if they have marketable Government bonds they had better watch the bond market, and if they have to sell any pretty soon, they had better sell them now. I am here referring to marketable Government issues and not to the nonmarketable savings issues.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD today some information relative to the Department of Agriculture. It is amazing that under the regulations and requests of the Department of Agriculture the number of cattle in this country has been reduced by 7,000,000 in the last 5 years. They are asking for a further reduction this year of 517,000 in the breeding stock in the face of a beef shortage.

The record will also show, and you can take it from the Department's own figures, that there has been a reduction of about 20,000,000 sheep in this country in the last 5 years. There has been a marked reduction in the number of hogs and cattle. I would like to know why such a program is being carried on in the face of an expanding population, which in the last 10 years has increased by about 1,500,000 each year.

There are some 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 more people in the United States today with mouths to feed, yet there seems to be a planned program in the Department of Agriculture which says that you can have prosperity with scarcity.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one, to include an editorial from Iron Age, entitled "To His Fingertips," a letter from a father to his son; and, in the second, to include an editorial from the Bristol Courier entitled, "Let Us Have the Facts."

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of living can, and must, come down. It can be done by just good common-sense methods—methods of equality for all—give and take. Give advice to those who are getting too much of the world's goods, and if they do not heed, then take a little from them. This applies to business, labor, and agriculture, and any other occupation—lawyer, doctor, minister, and so forth. The law made years and years ago should apply. That law is termed the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as ye would that men should do unto you."

I shall cite just one change today. For instance, the Government guarantees that the farmer should get $2 a bushel for wheat. Well, that may not be excessive, with his high labor cost, but the great mass of American consumers should not have to pay more than $2 a bushel for wheat when he guarantees the farmer that amount by his Government, which, by the way, is the people of America. We are almost guaranteeing to feed the world. All wheat shipped out of our country is given away by ERP, or the Marshall plan, or call it ECP, if you choose. They, to me, are all the same. On the international wheat agreement, which ratification was requested in the

President's summons of the extra session of Congress, under this agreement we were pledged to export 185,000,000 bushels of wheat a year for 5 years at prices ranging from $1.10 to $2 a bushel. This subsidy was estimated to cost the United States $150,000,000 during the year ending July 1, 1948. Some subsidy for America to pay to give wheat to foreigners. If it had been to feed the starving, I would have been for it, but no such evidence was given.

The President is responsible for the head of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, being appointed. He is the right arm of the Truman administration in the Agriculture Department. Several years ago you paid 12 cents for a large loaf of bread. Today the same loaf costs 21 cents. That is the greatest item of food we have—bread, bread, bread. Everybody likes it, everybody needs it. Bread is the staff of life. That is why so much is used every day. Its cost has risen almost 100 percent in price; in some instances more than 100 percent. The President takes credit to the farmer for raising the price of wheat and wages that goes into the loaf of bread. Now he blames us Republicans for the high cost of the bread to the consumer. Is that right? Is that just? I ask you, Is that honest? You Americans who use bread ask yourselves the question, Who raises your high prices higher? Bread from 12 cents a loaf to 21 cents a loaf. But, bread eaters, that is not all; if we can give bread to foreigners, why should not we cut the cost to Americans if necessary? Is the Agriculture Department suggesting that? Oh, no. Let me show you what Mr. Truman and his Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, are proposing doing to the next year's wheat crop just because we are producing too much wheat in the United States. This is what they propose to do in regulating wheat production for 1949:

	Acres
1948 wheat acreage in United States of America	77,715,000
1949 proposed wheat acreage	71,500,000
The Department of Agriculture demands less acreage be planted	6,215,000

Why? To keep wheat scarce so the price of bread will stay up, I suppose, so that we can guarantee the farmer $2.14 to $2.20 a bushel subsidy at Philadelphia. Suppose the 6,215,000 acres taken out of cultivation would yield 30 bushels to the acre on the average. That would mean production of 186,450,000 bushels more of wheat; that should reduce the cost of wheat to the baker and, in turn, the cost of bread to the consumer.

But the administration does not want to do that. They want to make wheat more scarce. Does it make sense to you housewives who have to pay 21 cents a loaf for bread? You have the answer—no; a thousand times no. But your President Truman is running the Agriculture Department that way. I say it is time for a change.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in each, to include certain addenda.

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee I feel it a great privilege to take the floor to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

While I have served on this powerful committee only during the Eightieth Congress, I feel that I have been especially favored in working with the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative KNUTSON, in his revenue program. Under his expert leadership the Congress has reduced taxes $4,800,000,000 despite three Presidential vetoes, with 71 percent of the tax relief going to those with incomes under $5,000; 7,400,000 wage earners in the lowest brackets removed from the tax roll; married couples allowed to divide their income for tax purposes, and special relief provided for persons over 65 years of age, and for the blind. A bill to extend social-security coverage has also been passed by the House and is now pending in the Senate. This record alone is a tribute to the man, and to his leadership. His name is a worthy addition to the roll of illustrious men who have attained the chairmanship of the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

Congressman KNUTSON's career as a man and as a statesman is typical of the American way of life. He emigrated to this country from Norway at an early age. His honesty, perseverance, industry, and integrity have made for him an honored place in his community and in his State. He has served his country well in the House of Representatives for 31 long years. My best wishes follow him for many more years of public service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in each, to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to address the House on the subject Old-Age Pensions. In my opinion, if there is one subject that constitutes an emergency, calling for action by this special session of the Congress, it is this very subject.

I know of no greater need, Mr. Speaker, than the need for more adequate security for our deserving elder citizens. I know of no field where the need is greater and where the efforts of the Congress thus far have come so far short in meeting the need.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] and myself are extending our joint remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today on this subject. I trust every Member of the House, and particularly the House leadership will read this extension carefully.

The people of this country are calling loudly upon the Congress for a decent American old-age pension. They are sick and tired of this meagre hodgepodge called old-age assistance. A decent old-age pension will not seriously aggravate inflation as might appear to some of us, because the small incomes of our elders, even after they receive a decent pension, will not be a serious factor in the matter of inflation. Pensions, or our excuse for pensions called assistance, have always been entirely inadequate. Now, with 58-cent dollars, they are intolerable. The need is too great to ignore. The people want action. In addition to that a majority of the Members of this House have joined together in a written friendly request for action. Mr. Speaker, if there is one piece of legislation that should have the attention of this special session of the Congress, it is this very matter. Let us enact a decent American old-age pension. Let us do it now.

PROGRESS UNDER LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Strike idleness in 1947 and 1948 was far less than in the record year of 1946, and also less than 1945. Approximately 3,700 stoppages occurred in 1947 in which 2,170,000 workers were involved as against 4,985 stoppages in 1946 in which 4,600,000 workers were involved. Idleness amounted to 34,600,000 man-days in 1947 as compared to 116,000,000 man-days in 1946. At an average daily wage of $8 American workers lost $928,000,000 due to work stoppages in 1946, in comparison to a loss of $276,800,000 in 1947.

Since the Labor-Management Relations Act became effective strikes have decreased substantially. Work stoppages under the old law average 415 per month in 1946. They have been cut to 219 under the new law.

Work stoppages

Month	1946	1947	1948
January	337	321	175
February	290	296	200
March	440	361	225
April	504	479	275
May	376	471	275
June	388	379	310
July	563	315	
August	560	326	
September	499	219	
October	516	219	
November	344	178	
December	168	119	
Total	4,985	3,683	

	Number of strikes	Workers involved	Man-days idle
Aug. 22 to Dec. 31, 1947	781	250,000	5,000,000
January-June 1947	1,460	1,150,000	21,800,000
July-August estimate	575	330,000	4,000,000
Total	2,81	1,730,000	31,700,000

The record shows that under the new law wages have continued to rise, more leisure time has been made available through a shorter workweek and average hourly earnings also have increased. Wages have increased 7.4 percent and prices have increased 7.1 percent since the passage of the act.

Labor is making these gains through peaceful, collective bargaining, whereas before the new labor law gains were more frequently made through costly strikes.

The President and my opponent want to repeal this act. If this act is repealed we will return to the following labor abuses. I know you would not want to see or hear of these labor abuses again.

First. Milk spoils in labor row because milkers refused to join the union.

Second. Army sergeant picketed because he did not think he had to join a union to run a one-man butcher shop.

Third. Sixty carloads of lemons dumped in citrus strike.

Fourth. Sheep must be sheared by union sheep shearers.

Fifth. Wholesaler who had been in business 50 years in Philadelphia, Pa., was given 15 minutes to get off the street unless his clerk joined the union.

Sixth. A truckload of produce was returned home because the driver would not pay the union $53 to unload—Riverside, N. J.

Seventh. Union stops the delivery of oil to two veterans unless they pay initiation fee of $37.50 on a certain date, after that date it would be $75.

Eighth. A shipyard worker in San Francisco was forced to give $1 to the Democratic Party and was discharged for saying he would give the Republican Party $2.

Ninth. Union refuses to let marines act as pallbearers for one of their own killed in line of duty when he was brought back for reburial.

Tenth. Communist labor leaders closed down Allis-Chalmers plant in Wisconsin whose employees were engaged in vital defense work for the Navy in time of war.

Eleventh. The union labor leaders on Dock Street, Philadelphia, demanded the right to tell the wholesalers when they could enter their own place of business.

Twelfth. Two hundred and forty-seven thousand five hundred pounds of oranges were dumped because of strike, which were to have been used by the Government in defense and lend-lease programs.

Thirteenth. Innocent people were injured and their property was damaged in Pittsburgh, Pa., due to open warfare between two unions.

Fourteenth. Building trades in Chicago refused to erect a building because the stone was cut by union labor in the Bloomington-Bedford limestone district of Indiana.

Fifteenth. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars worth of asparagus was dumped in one pile in California.

Sixteenth. Lady lost $3,000 in the turkey business because she would not hire union turkey pickers.

Seventeenth. Eighty thousand tons of spinach lost due to labor tie-up.

Eighteenth. A Richmond, Va., farmer had to pay union men $7 for 1 hour's work to unload a load of apples.

Nineteenth. Union stops sailor from going into the wholesale business because he wanted to buy his own truck and hire his own union driver.

Twentieth. Cafe employees refused to join union in Burbank, Calif., and as a result there was stench bombing, acid throwing in patrons' cars, tires and seat cushions slashed on employees' cars, roofing nails put in the streets in front of cafe and five plate windows were broken.

Twenty-first. Pigeons and mice were turned loose in New York department store, by pickets.

Twenty-second. A New York wholesaler was attacked and badly beaten by two men because he was selling to certain chain stores.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POTTS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune.

SUPPORT PRICES AND INFLATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I have just submitted for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune entitled "Support Prices and Inflation."

I think it would be well for all of us, particularly the Committee on Agriculture, to read that editorial. We all recall the days of the early New Deal when farmers were being paid not to grow this and not to grow that and for killing off every other head of cattle and every other hog, and so forth. Now we have a turn-about, and when we have a tremendous surplus, as for instance, of potatoes, they get paid to grow more of that particular crop. It is a vicious circle in which the housewife and the city folks get no benefit whatsoever.

I think this is a very worth-while editorial, and for that reason I have asked to insert it in the RECORD.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address by Senator CAPPER.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include substantiating evidence.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Grand Haven Tribune.

Mr. BUCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was granted permision to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper editorial.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and all special orders heretofore entered I may proceed for 20 minutes today.

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

There was no objection.

EXPORTATION OF TEXTILES FROM CUBA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks on the question of Cuba's licensing of exportation of textiles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 9 the Cuban Government passed a regulation requiring a license upon all textiles imported into Cuba. The imposition of this license or tax upon textiles is of great importance to our country as a whole, but particularly to the South and more especially to my district, the largest textile district in the world. Cuba is a great country. Relations between our two countries have been most pleasant. They might be compared to that of a larger and smaller brother. From our viewpoint the imposition of this license seems ill-advised. We have been in the textile business for generations. Spinning and weaving of cotton goods have been developed to the very highest degree. Machinery of the last word has been installed in our textile plants and those who work in them possess skill and ability, producing results almost beyond belief. While maintaining a high-wage level and providing unprecedented conveniences and advantages to textile workers, the finished products have been kept within reasonable price levels. Until comparatively recent times Cuba has not gone in for the manufacture of textiles. It is believed she does not possess sufficient spindles and looms now to supply required textiles for her people. The levying of this new license fee would work to the disadvantage of the citizens of Cuba by raising the price of textiles there and depriving the citizens of the fine textiles from the States. At the same time the market for our textiles would be seriously impaired if not altogether lost. We need the Cuban market for our textiles in order to assure uninterrupted, profitable employment for our people. Cuba needs our textiles so as to receive necessary clothing for her people at a price they are financially able to pay.

Today I conferred at length with the State Department about this grave problem and am happy to report that continuous friendly negotiations are now going on between the two governments, following the note of protest filed soon after the imposition of the import license.

We have reason to believe and sincerely hope that presently the Cuban Government will greatly modify, if not altogether repeal, the import license. The ability to negotiate with other nations and to effectuate satisfactory solutions of controverted problems without serious difficulty or even a threat of war, is the goal toward which all nations should strive.

IDLEWILD AIRPORT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of this Congress and the people of our country in national defense, I think it is proper that we should take notice of the dedication of the Idlewild Airport in the city of New York on last Saturday. It is one of the largest airports in the world. The Air Force sent its latest jet fighters and heavy bombers in a thundering, low-level parade during the aerial demonstration dedicating New York's new $200,000,000 international airport, and I am sure that every one who was there was greatly impressed with the magnificent demonstration by our Air Force. I was especially impressed with the skill in flight formation of the National Guard and the Naval Reserve fliers who participated in that magnificent demonstration. I am sure that those fliers will be just as successful in combat, if necessary, as they were in formation.

On that occasion the Governor of New York and the President of the United States were present. Governor Dewey said:

> The 4,900-acre Idlewild Airport, largest in the world, was a demonstration of what men of good will can do, surmounting technical obstacles, local prejudices, and even suspicion and obstruction.

President Truman said that this was a demonstration of our determination to remain strong in the cause of peace. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that there were unofficial Russian observers, and I hope that their report on this magnificent air-power demonstration has reached Moscow by this time.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the majority leader asked unanimous consent that the Rules Committee might have until tomorrow night to file a privileged report. Up to now the Rules Committee has not met and I wonder whether they are going to bring in a rule making in order a bill to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living, and also a rule on a housing bill. The ever-increasing cost of living is such that the American people cannot stand it any longer. I hope the majority leader realizes that something must be done without delay to reduce the high—yes, the criminal high cost of living and also provide real housing for the thousands upon thousands of our ex-servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, within the last few days due to the crusade of the housewives against the high prices of meats the prices of some meat cuts have been reduced, but I feel this lowering of prices is only temporary notwithstanding that the storage warehouses are jammed with meats. Despite the plentiful warehouse supply, I am satisfied that the big packers in conjunction with the National Association of Manufacturers, will not permit the majority to enact legislation which would bring about a real reduction in the cost of meats and meat products. From what I have heard and observed since Congress reconvened, I am convinced that this Republican-controlled Congress will not be permitted to enact any legislation at this special session and will force adjournment without the passage of any legislation to relieve the people from the high cost of living or to provide decent living quarters for those desperately seeking homes. If relief is not forthcoming, the consumers will be obliged to follow the suggestion of one of the Republican Presidential candidates to eat less. They have been eating less and will continue to eat less for the next 4 months when they will elect men to the Congress who will not be controlled by the avaricious, profit-greedy combines, special interests and trusts to whom you are subservient and who seem to control your action.

Mr. Speaker, if it is the purpose of the request of the majority leader to permit the Committee on Rules to file rules on these two important relief measures, naturally I am in favor of such request and I hope the Republican majority will heed the general demand and plea of the American people to be relieved from the intolerable conditions that now exist.

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

Mr. SABATH. If I have the time I will gladly yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has the time.

Mr. SABATH. Before I forget it, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

THE BLUE AND GRAY CRADLE ASSOCIATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last week, the noted columnist, Drew Pearson, in his syndicated column, told something about the Blue and Gray Cradle Association of Montgomery, Ala., which city is in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent. He cited the progress that has been made in the South by those who are helping to bring about better relations between all sections of the Nation and between the white and colored races.

The history of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association is an interesting one. The idea was developed by Champ Pickens, who serves as general manager, and who is a great sportsman and an enthusiastic supporter of the University of Alabama football team, known throughout the Nation as the Thin Red Line, but which in more recent years has come to be known as the Red Elephants.

When Wallace Wade was coaching at the University of Alabama, Champ Pickens was instrumental in securing a bid for the University of Alabama to represent the East in the Tournament of Roses at Pasadena, Calif. Alabama was enthusiastically received on the coast and, since that time, has represented the East many times in this classic tournament. The fighting qualities and sportsmanship of these players endeared the university to the West, and the Nation, with the result that thousands of students from the East, and other sections of the Nation, enrolled at Alabama.

Realizing the good will that could be brought about by athletics, Champ Pickens sold the late William Gunter, mayor of the city of Montgomery, upon the idea of forming the Blue and Gray Cradle Association to sponsor a Blue and Gray championship football game to be known as the North versus South and to be played annually in Montgomery, the Cradle of the Confederacy. While the football game was to be the chief annual sporting event of the association, other sporting events were arranged between individuals and clubs represented by selected and outstanding players from the North and the South.

The unique feature of this football game is that none of the players are paid anything and that the entire proceeds, beyond the actual expenses, are devoted exclusively to charity. The Blue and Gray Cradle Association is a nonprofit organization and its officers and members throughout the Nation receive no benefit other than the satisfaction of doing something worth while to cement relations between the North and South and to aid charity.

After the death of Montgomery's beloved Mayor Gunter, each succeeding mayor, Cyrus B. Brown, David Earl Dunn, and John L. Goodwyn, as the representative of the city government, has taken a keen interest in this great work. At the present time Fred A. Duran is president, W. B. Paterson, Sr., vice president, Frank Rosa, treasurer, and Frank E. Boyd, secretary. All of these men give freely of their time and talents toward attaining

the objectives of the association. The programs for the big game are sold by the Lions Club, the proceeds being given to aid the blind.

This annual football game has the reputation of having, upon both the North's and South's squads, the outstanding football talent of the Nation. The selection of the players also is unique in that each player is a senior. At these games more All-American players have been seen together upon the field than at any other one football game in the Nation. During the war years it was necessary to use, in addition to seniors, other outstanding players.

Each year, two, or more often, three outstanding football coaches of the South, and an equal number from the North, are selected to coach their respective teams and they, with the players, meet in Montgomery prior to the game where both squads are received with open arms by the people of the city.

The Blue and Gray football game is played on the last Saturday of each December, in order that it may not interfere with the other bowl games. Many of the sports writers, commentators, and fans who attend the other games on the first of January make it a point to stop over in Montgomery for this classic event. There has been so much interest in the game that it has been broadcast by national hook-up for several years, and during the war was broadcast by short wave over the world.

This game is outstanding in that it is not played on a commercial basis. The players all feel that they are making a worth-while contribution to a worthy cause and give their all. While the South generally has more rooters, every good play by the northern squad receives the plaudits of the crowd. I have never heard of a northern player who did not want to return to Montgomery for another game. Oftentimes you find southern boys who are attending school in other sections of the country playing with the North squad, and northern boys for a like reason, playing on the South squad.

If we are to remain a great nation, this spirit of friendship must prevail. Somehow I think that the pattern for this spirit must have started in April 1863 when a little group of southern women visited a cemetery near Columbus, Miss., and there decorated the graves of their Confederate dead. One lady of the group, after she had decorated the graves of her two sons who had lost their lives in defense of the South's cause, was seen walking toward a corner of the cemetery where lay buried two unknown Union soldiers. One of the group asked her what she was doing: "Do you know whose graves those are?" "Yes, indeed, they are two Union soldiers—they are Yankees," said the mother of the two soldiers, "I do not forget they are nameless graves marking where two northern soldiers lie buried, but somewhere in the North, in some little city, or village, or perhaps in some lonely farmhouse, a mother, or a young wife, or a sweetheart, mourns for them, just as you and I grieve for the loss of our loved ones." She went on to the unmarked graves and stooped over and tenderly spread her flowers over them. "We bring these flowers," she said, "to express our love and devotion to our dead—our heroes of the South. These unknown soldiers of the North lying here in our churchyard are also dead, but when the war is over and peace comes again, we shall call them ours, so here are my lilacs and roses, red, white, and blue for both alike." "And mine," "and mine," "and mine, too," said the other women as they added their flowers on the unmarked graves of the northern soldiers in the corner of the little southern churchyard.

Each succeeding year the women of Columbus repeat this beautiful deed for southern and northern soldiers alike.

We members of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association thank Drew Pearson for his tribute to the spirit that prompts the creation of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association and know that in the days to come this kindness upon his part will go far toward bringing about unity for which we all hope and strive.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a newspaper article and in the other an address he delivered in Chelsea, Mass.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter he sent to some constituents.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the other special orders now on the Speaker's desk.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 7056, making it possible for persons drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1948—Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, second session—to choose the type of units in which they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that as a member of the Armed Services Committee I have found it necessary to introduce such legislation, but in my opinion it is important that such an act become the law in the interest of the very safety of our country.

For a number of years it has been popular for the leaders of both the Republican and Democratic Parties to stir up the miscalled civil-rights bills every election year. Everyone recognizes that such measures have been brought up and agitated in the past for the purpose of obtaining the vote of the Negro and other minorities in the northern cities. Such a practice is destructive to the best interests of America. It has always caused strife and ill feeling, and in my opinion has been harmful all along, and is becoming more so. In the past, however, there has been no real determined effort to force the breaking down of segregation. During the present Congress we have seen the President of the United States appear before this Congress and urge the breaking down of segregation between whites and Negroes. This was a follow-up of his written message some months ago, striking at segregation between the races. Now, as never before, it seems that the leaders of the Democratic Party are determined to strike at the system which has prevailed in my section throughout the history of this Nation. Some few may be conscientious, but I am sure that the vast majority would do this in an effort to obtain votes in the coming election. This is tragic.

Mr. Speaker, the racial question is one that has plagued nations throughout the history of the world. It is one of the prime causes of strife in many European countries today. It is the cause of much strife in northern cities today. I do not know that there is any perfect answer to the question, but I am sure that the segregation of the races, as provided by custom and by law in the Southern States, is the best method of handling this difficult problem, difficult in other regions but not in the South. We have no real problem there, and will not have, unless those who agitate this question for their own personal gain succeed in trying to upset the balance by the use of Federal force. It will be a sad mistake for this Congress ever to take such action.

Mr. Speaker, such efforts as have been made by the President of the United States to get this Congress to pass such legislation is bad enough, but on the 26th day of July, the President issued an order having to do with breaking down segregation in the armed services. He followed this Executive order with a statement in the press that the order was issued for the purpose of eventually breaking down segregation in the armed services. I say that such an order breaks faith with the conscientious Members of the Congress who regretted deeply having to vote out the Draft Act for those in charge of the armed services in the consideration of the Draft Act led members of the committee to believe that no such action would be taken. Relying upon these assurances the Draft Act was passed; it was passed because it appeared then, and it now appears, that the very safety of our Nation is dependent upon adequate armed services. Thousands of our young men have volunteered for service because of their patriotism and in their willingness to do their part. A great number of volunteers have come from the South, and they took such action, relying upon the continuation of the segregation practices of the Army. Now

we see the Commander in Chief, by Executive order, breaking down such practice, in spite of the statements of those who know, or should know, what is essential to maintaining the best Army possible.

Our military leaders recognize that we cannot destroy segregation in the services at this time. General Bradley, in a speech in New York City on the 18th of January 1948, stated as follows:

> Our free democratic traditions of equal opportunity, civil rights, and the freedom of the individual to assert himself against institutions, is too strongly implanted in our young men to warrant anything but a democratic Army. And while greater control is required in the armed forces than in other fields of employment, I believe this authority can be exercised fairly, intelligently, and judiciously without impairing a man's basic human rights.
>
> Our best chance for the realization of any army that will mirror this tradition in human rights, lies in the recruitment of officers and men whose intelligence and integrity assure respect for the dignity of the men with whom they work. Yet to attract these officers and men, we must be able to offer them the emoluments, opportunities, and privileges that they would have in civilian life.

In a statement dated June 28, 1948, Secretary Royall stated as follows:

> The question of integration involves a vital problem of social reform to be achieved first by the people of the United States and then by the United States Army.

Testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in April, General Eisenhower described the Army as "one of the mirrors that reflect America," and said, in effect, that as long as there is race segregation in American civilian life, the Army will have to follow that pattern.

It is reported that General Bradley told a news conference at Fort Knox, Ky.:

> The Army is not out to make any social reforms. The Army will put men of different races in different companies. It will change that policy when the Nation as a whole changes it.

The bill which I have introduced attempts to give enlistees and those who subsequently volunteer the right to choose to serve with members of their own race upon their specific request. It simply preserves freedom of choice in the individual as to the race of the military unit in which he is forced to serve. The enactment of such a bill 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 would be allowed those of any and all races of our people, whether belonging to the majority or whether called a minority. It would not discriminate against any citizen or group of citizens. It would not take away anything from anyone. It could not harm or injure anyone. It would 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 would not change the present policy of assignments used by the Army and Air Corps.

Mr. Speaker, does the President mean that a Negro has a right to serve in a white company, and that he will see to it that he can serve in such a white unit, but that the white boy does not have the right to serve in a white unit; that the Negro has the right under the Constitution to share the association of white boys, even those who do not wish to associate with him, but that the white youth has no right to associate with whom he pleases and to be free from association with those he does not wish to associate?

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee for a number of years. We, on that committee, recognize that we face a grave situation today. Now, as perhaps never before, we need to be united. Now, as never before, we do not need strife in the Nation, and certainly we do not need strife within our armed services themselves. Would it not be tragic for members of the armed services to have to spend a great deal of their time and of their force trying to maintain an unnatural system foisted upon them by the unwise decision of the President? It must not be.

Mr. Speaker, the very safety of our country demands the passage of H. R. 7056, which I have introduced. It is needed to keep faith with the Members of the Congress who supported the draft bill, because they believed it necessary to save our country. This bill must be passed to keep faith with the thousands of southern boys, and northern boys, too, for that matter, who have volunteered in the armed services, relying upon the system of segregation being maintained therein. Mr. Speaker, it is needed to keep peace within the armed services themselves.

The provisions of this bill are unfair to no one. That Negro who prefers to serve in an all-Negro unit may do so, and it is my belief that most of them would prefer an all-Negro unit, and it permits the white youths to choose companies of their own race, and then those who may want to serve in mixed units may do so. In my opinion, the all-black units and the all-white units will far excel those units that are mixed, judging by those citizens who preach amalgamation of the races that I have observed. I firmly believe that in view of the President's Executive order and his statement as to its intent, it is absolutely necessary that the Congress enact H. R. 7056, so that our armed services will not be torn by dissention in this time of great danger. I urge all to get behind this measure before our country is destroyed from within. We cannot afford to permit the armed services to be torn by dissension because of anybody's desire to win an election.

REDUCTION IN PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMED SERVICES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, is there a Member of Congress who is willing to propose a reduction in pay now for the personnel of our armed services? Obviously the answer is "No."

But, Mr. Speaker, do you know that every single person in the service, from the lowliest rank to the highest brass in the Army, in the Navy, in the Marine Corps, and in the Air Corps, will suffer a pay cut next January? It will be all-embracing. That is the law as it stands today, and I am not mistaken about it.

Mr. Speaker, what an injustice and what a shattering blow this will be to the morale of our men and women in our armed services, a blow not only to those stationed here in the United States but also to those stationed at far distant places of the globe. And what can be said to those whose terms of service are at or near the expiration point? Can you imagine that they will be receptive to pleas to reenlist, or in the case of commissioned Reserve officers, to accept a further tour of duty?

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing that can have a more demoralizing effect than a pay reduction, which would not only be totally unexpected but absolutely unwarranted.

Mr. Speaker, serious damage to our national defense can only be averted by congressional action at this special session. A very short and simple bill, House Joint Resolution 431, which I introduced on June 16, 1948, can be passed by both Houses of Congress in less than 1 hour. This bill would only maintain the present scales of pay for all service personnel.

Mr. Speaker, let us meet our responsibility in this important matter without any delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remark in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT TO PRESENT DP BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the steering committee on the Republican side whether they are going to bring in a DP bill to offset and do away with the inequalities and the proscriptions contained in the Revercomb-Wiley bill which we passed in the previous session. It is generally accepted that the wrongs of that bill should be righted and despite the denials made on the floor and elsewhere I maintain that that bill contains some very invidious discriminations, geographic discriminations, occupational discriminations, racial-religious discriminations and particularly a calendar discrimination that relief is imperative. Because the cut-off date, for example, was set at December 22, 1945, only a few months after the shooting stopped, great

injustice was done. The International Refugee Organization and General Clay are of the opinion that the cut-off date should be as of the date when the camps were closed officially, namely, April 21, 1947. That earlier cut-off date shuts off many, many deserving DP's, DP's of the type that would make good citizens in this fair land of ours.

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

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

Mr. RICH. Would the gentleman want everybody to come over here who wants to come over from the other side?

Mr. CELLER. Of course not. I want the deserving to come in. I would welcome the DP's who suffered immeasureably at Hitler's hands. That would be a matter of humanity. But also these delayed pilgrims have the courage, the stamina, the integrity, the willingness to work, and fullest appreciation of the liberties that America accords her citizens. Their admission would be a matter of enlightened self-interest.

I remind my Republican colleagues that Governor Dewey is for all-out relief of the DP's, and I remind my Democratic colleagues that our platform contains promise of relief along the lines I suggest.

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

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1948, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the United States Office of Education, I received a copy of a letter written by John W. Studebaker, former Commissioner of Education, addressed to Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

The newspapers throughout the country have given much space to this letter. In order that the public and the Members of Congress may have the benefit of the information contained in this letter, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of these remarks. The letter itself is self-explanatory.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 30, 1948.*

Hon. OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: In my letter of resignation, dated June 14, 1948, addressed to the President, I stated the basic reason why it seemed inadvisable for me to remain longer in the Government service beyond July 15, namely, the impossibility of providing for the proverbial "rainy day" with the top salary allowed for the Commissioner of Education.

Now, however, I desire to supplement various communications I sent you and conversations I had with you while in office on matters having to do with your policies of organization and administration, for the purpose of pointing out again some of the implications of the program you have had under way during recent months.

In summary, it is my considered opinion that if your purposes and program are carried out you will do great harm not only to proper and adequate work of the United States Office of Education, but indeed also to the vital need for Federal participation in the support of equal educational opportunity among the States.

Before going further, I wish to say that in presenting certain facts and points of view herein, I do not feel the slightest personal animus toward you or anyone else, regardless of the extent to which I obviously share with educators and the people in general a deep anxiety concerning the functions and control of education.

While, of course, many of your policies and administrative procedures affect the other constituent or operating organizations of the Federal Security Agency—United States Public Health Service, Social Security and Welfare Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Food and Drug Administration—I shall not presume to speak for them, although I know there exists great uneasiness and a markedly low morale among the personnel of all branches of the Agency. Nor do I wish here to write at length relative to the adverse effects of your program on education. I shall therefore confine my statements to some basic principles and a few illustrations.

A fundamental fault in your policies lies, it seems to me, in your failure to recognize that imaginative, competent, and productive work in any institution or agency is done by imaginative, competent, and zestful individuals who are happy in their work and who are eager to assume and carry responsibility, not by elaborate, regimental schemes of organization. Your program of administration therefore violates the great principle which has energized American life—the encouragement of personal responsibility; it violates the principle of decentralization and distribution of initiative and responsibility which results in great strength and productivity in the Nation because there is great strength and productivity among its millions of individual citizens.

Your program develops frustration and a feeling of futility among the employed personnel because individuals and units of individuals in the Agency cannot control the means to the ends for which they are responsible.

The most successful private and public enterprises are those in which to the maximum practicable extent the spheres of authority and of responsibility of individuals and of units of individuals are kept identical. Your program leaves responsibility with people "down the line" in the organization so to speak, but strips away from them the control of the essential means by which their responsibility must be executed. You vest authority in your immediate staff members, but they are not and will not be held responsible by the people for any shortcomings or failures of the operating organizations of the Agency. As frustration and futility develop, responsibility for the exercise of intiative, for the use of judgment, for securing results, also tends to move "up the line." Here we see at work what might be called "bureaucratic statism" within a government originally dedicated to the principle of individual responsibility and respect for personality. Thorough regimentation always has been and always will be destructive of individual responsibility, a quality vital to the continued progress of our country.

Let me illustrate. For many years, always I assume since the United States Office of Education was established 81 years ago, and I know during 7 (1934-41) of the 14 years while I was Commissioner of Education, the articles, bulletins, addresses on educational matters were written freely by the professional people in the Office of Education in their respective special fields and were published. Sensing their individual responsibility, these professional people sought advice from competent persons from time to time, even though they were writing in their own fields of competence. So far as I know there was never any difficulty or embarrassment experienced by the Office of Education as a result of this policy.

After Pearl Harbor and during the war, there was a willingness that the OWI should check and approve all public statements. We were at war and citizens generally accepted necessary wartime controls. We in the Office of Education naturally assumed that with the war ended, such controls of professional writing would be relinquished. They were not only continued, but they have been made more sweeping, complete, and time consuming within the Federal Security Agency. Now, any statement written by anyone in the Office of Education to be presented to any group or audience outside the Office must be submitted to someone on your immediate staff for approval. These approvals, of course, involve statements ranging all the way from articles on such technical questions as planning science classrooms to the more general problems of education.

A specific example may be cited. Last April one of the staff members of the Office of Education, a well-trained man, with excellent experience in secondary education, was invited to speak to the high-school principals of the State of Massachusetts. He was to speak on the subject Teaching Zeal for American Democracy. Under an appropriation by Congress for 1948 made to the Office of Education, specific reference was made by the Congress to the need for such a program and especially for an educational program that would make clear to our young people the nature and tactics of communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

This man in the Office of Education himself decided to read his address. He prepared it. Consequently, under your regulations the address had to be submitted to your staff for approval. A few paragraphs of the address stressed the importance of developing means of teaching high-school pupils what communism really is, how inimical it is to the free world. Your staff member in a written comment said, in part, "Much of this is very good. However, the Office of Education should, I am convinced, leave to the State Department and to the FBI the task of exposing the tactics and dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers."

Now, in the light of the main purpose of Congress in making the afore-mentioned appropriation, an action obviously based on a clear recognition of the great need for an educational program that would adequately inform young people concerning the serious conflict between totalitarianism and freedom, is it not amazing that a leading educator in the United States Office of Education, operating under a thoroughly bipartisan mandate of Congress, should be told by one who had been put in a position to tell the Office of Education what it could and could not do, that the educational task of exposing the tactics and the dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers should be left to the State Department and the FBI?

All of us in education fully appreciate the parts that the State Department and the FBI should play in exposing Communists. These agencies know what their parts are and they know their function is not to work with schools and colleges on the development of educational programs dealing with this problem. To accept the dictum that the educational "task of exposing communism" should be left to these agencies would be tantamount to not having this vitally important educational task done at all, at least so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The result was that the man from the Office of Education abandoned the plan to present a written address. He had no time to try to revise it and to receive approval. He, therefore, held an "off the record" meeting with the Massachusetts high-school principals. In the meeting he said, ad libitum, all he had on his mind and heart about how education can help in the solution of a problem the magnitude of which is daily becoming more apparent to everyone. Thus the representative of the Office of Education was able to express his opinion to the principals of Massachusetts, and that's what the principals wanted. They had not requested the opinion of some one on your immediate staff not known to them.

Another illustration. I made an address at the University of California at Los Angeles last March, entitled "Education and the Fate of Democracy." Senator KNOWLAND, of California, as you know is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education. The Senator, being very much interested in the whole subject, had the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the address among other things about communism, I said the following: "Whether or not the Communist Party in this country should be outlawed, I do not presume to say. But of this I am convinced: That no avowed or proven Communist is fit to be entrusted with the job of inculcating the American way of life in any school; and I make that statement on the rather obvious ground that education for American democracy cannot be entrusted to the enemies of American democracy."

Since the Office of Education has had only a relatively small appropriation for printing, every reasonable economy has been exercised in carrying out the major purpose of the Office as provided in its basic act; namely, "to diffuse information about education."

The California address was printed on one sheet of paper. I requested enough copies so that one copy could be sent to each college, one to each public and private high school, and one to each superintendent of schools. The Office of Education requisition for these copies, to be paid for by the Office (about $250), was held up by one of your staff for several days and was only approved after he and I had engaged in a vigorous discussion of the matter in which, for the most part, he was trying to convince me that such language as I used in the address should be toned down and that if the address were released (this in spite of the fact that it had already been printed in the public record), he felt sure it would bring unfavorable reaction from a large number of educators. It was released and distributed in May. I have heard no objection from anyone.

Last December, copy was ready for a special issue of the monthly periodical School Life. The issue was to be devoted entirely to contrasting totalitarianism and freedom and in pointing up various educational implications of the conflict. I was away when the manuscript, in accordance with your regulations, was submitted to your staff for approval. It was reported to me later that there was very definite resistance by another one of your staff to the entire publication. It was finally published and has been a Government "best seller" ever since.

These are only two illustrations of the way in which your policies leave the professional people in the Office of Education responsible for achieving fruitful results in helping to improve American education while transferring to your immediate staff the authority to control the means and procedures by which these professional people carry their responsibility. This divorcement of responsibility and authority with respect to the work of the Office of Education necessarily results in the same divorcement in the divisions and sections of the Office and with all of its individuals. The result is a strange feeling of uncertainty and fear among employees. The whole scheme is well designed to devitalize and demoralize the staff.

Apparently you do not feel that your present, large, immediate staff can control, to the extent you desire, the detailed activities within the Office of Education and the other constituent organizations of the agency having to do with publications, editorial work, and information services. Accordingly under date of May 26, last, you had an order issued under which you propose to centralize in your office all personnel now engaged in such services in the various constituent organizations, including the Office of Education. Under the order you propose to transfer 17 people from the supervision of the Office of Education to the administrative supervision of the Office of the Administrator, in spite of the fact that the appropriation that supports these people was made to the Office of Education.

I pointed out in my memorandum under date of June 12, 1948, the inappropriateness of the proposal and ways in which it would, if executed, work to the disadvantage of the services which the Office of Education is expected to render. My purpose here is merely to reinforce the arguments I made in that memorandum. In it I tried to make clear the intimate relationships which exist between the services of these people and the work of all other persons in the office. Verbally I had reported to you and other members of your staff that it has been the plan of the Office of Education to decentralize as much as possible among the several divisions of the Office of Education these types of services rather than to build up a large central staff even within the Office of Education. Eighty-one years of experience in the Office of Education proved the validity of the plans as formulated. Therefore it is not surprising that there should be among the personnel of the Office of Education such an unfavorable reaction to your proposal.

There can be no honest claim to economy in the transfer of administrative control which you propose. The 17 persons in the Office of Education have been working as hard and as efficiently as people could work. Besides, they have been working intelligently and enthusiastically because they were closely associated with the other people in the office to whose work their services are directly related. Merely to aggregate them with others in a centralized organization operating at a greater distance from those with whom they are expected to work and to put them under the supervision of someone on your staff who is not primarily interested in education will certainly reduce both their efficiency and enthusiasm, so far as education is concerned.

In another order issued by your office under date of June 12, entitled "Agency Office of Publications and Reports," the following statements are made:

In accordance with the Administrator's memorandum of May 26, relative to information service the following should be understood by all concerned:

1. There will be a central information office under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports.

2. Job classification sheets which have been applicable up to this time will be used until such time as it is possible to develop new sheets consistent with the organization to be established in the office of the Administrator.

3. As indicated in the original memorandum all persons will remain on the pay rolls of the constituents for the fiscal year 1949.

4. The 1950 budget will be prepared in such a way as to show in the Administrator's budget an Office of Publications and Reports consisting of the Office of Publications and Reports, Office of the Administrator plus transfers made by the Congress from the Social Security Administration Informational Service. Other information jobs will be budgeted so that they will appear on the pay rolls of the constituents.

Apart from the gross weaknesses in the proposed arrangement which I have tried to point out in this letter and elsewhere, does it not seem even to you illogical that the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency should be expected to prepare and justify appropriation estimates to include persons to be carried on the pay rolls of the respective constituents to work in the fields under discussion, but to work "under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports" on your staff? If it is logical and proper that these persons should be centralized into one unit for the Agency in general to be supervised administratively by your Director, would it not also seem logical and proper that they should be supported on a pay roll secured under an appropriation made in terms of the policy of administration which you propose to follow?

In other words, why do you propose to have them carried on the pay rolls supported by appropriations made by Congress to respective constituent units of the Agency, and then put them under the administrative supervision of someone on the Administrator's office staff? If they should be thus supervised (of course I do not believe they should) why are they not to be justified in the 1950 budget estimates as a part of the Administrator's office?

Under the arrangement you propose I do not see how Members of Congress can act intelligently as they consider appropriations which must of necessity be related to lines of organizational administration. Your plan seems to me to make nonsense of the serious efforts of Congressmen to consider requested appropriations in terms of the location of the direct responsibility for the administration of the functions to be supported by the appropriations.

No doubt you think of the Federal Security Agency as just one large monolithic welfare organization. Consequently, you think of education as merely one phase of welfare. When the problem is understood, very few people will agree with your conception. But if you really believe that the relationships between social security and education, health and education, and social security and health are exceedingly intimate and that education as a function in this country should be quite exclusively related to and integrated with health and welfare functions—I certainly do not—then you should ask the Congress for a single appropriation for a Federal office of welfare. But since the function of education is not a welfare function, since it necessarily represents a wide range of human interests and operates through well defined agencies and institutions, it should be supported by an appropriation made to the United States Office of Education in terms of justifications presented to Congress and break-downs therein determined.

These are some of the evidences of how your policy and program seem to obliterate the identity and the unity of action of the respective constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency; namely, the United States Public Health Service, Social Security Administration, United States Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration. There are others. Your order requiring the elimination of the words "United States" before the term "Public Health Service" and "Office of Education" in every case where it could be appropriately done; your suggestion that you did not see the sense in having an annual report for each of the constituent units, but only one for the Federal Security Agency as a whole; your policy to have yourself quoted in public releases even on technical matters of statistics and other reports of a factual character based on research of highly professional technicians in-

stead of having these technicians and their immediate supervisors quoted exclusively, all point to a trend toward centralization which is, as I have stated above, destructive of morale, of initiative, and of the kind of productive work on the part of a large number of employees to which the taxpaying public is entitled.

Finally the capstone of the argument against the centralization of control which you are developing, at least so far as education is concerned, is to be found in the fact that you are admittedly a partisan politician. You work hard for your party. Personally I have the most wholesome respect for our party system of government in the United States. I have never met finer men and women than those elected by both major parties to membership in the National Congress. But there is a deep-rooted tradition in this country, born of the harrowing experiences of the centuries, that the function of education in a democracy should be completely removed from partisanship. Political party control of public education is destructive of democracy and has proved to be so down through the years, and especially in recent decades in Italy, Germany, Russia, and Japan.

Being a partisan, you secure to the extent possible, as your immediate associates, persons who share your partisanship. Under the direction of yourself and of these associates you move constantly to centralize all policies, all approvals, in short, all control of the activities of the constituent organizations, including education. These controls contemplate the approval of personnel, of budgets, of substantive programs, and practically all details connected therewith. I am certain that such management of education on the Federal level is not what the great rank and file of the people of this country desire. On the contrary, they want the United States Office of Education to provide an adequate staff of competent professional educators who are in their positions to carry out the nonpartisan purposes for which the Office was established; they want a continuation of the devoted and completely nonpolitical professional service to American education that characterizes the work of the superior men and women who now comprise the staff of the Office of Education.

The American people may justly be proud of the personnel of the United States Office of Education. Every person in the Office has been selected through civil service in open competition and solely on the basis of his personal and professional qualifications. In my 14 years of intimate association with the employees in the Office, I never saw the slightest indication on the part of any one of them of any political party preference. Their lives are not actuated by partisanship; their backgrounds, their professional pride, their sense of obligation to true education in a democracy guide them in an unswerving devotion to the high calling of teaching. These are the kinds of people who in the Federal Government and in the States can really help education through schools and colleges to make its unique contribution to the preservation of our American free way of life. They are giving their lives passionately to that great objective. It isn't strange then that they, together with their colleagues throughout the country and citizens in general, regardless of political affiliation, should resent any attempts to color education with partisanship and cause its policies and processes to yield advantages to a political party.

This letter has become much longer than I intended. That is because there is so much to say on the subject.

I am sending copies of this letter to Dr. Willard Givens and Dr. E. B. Norton, who are, respectively, the executive secretaries of the National Education Association and the National Council of Chief State School Officers, organizations which, among many others, always have been active in efforts to secure a more adequate United States Office of Education and to insure such policies and methods of administration of educational activities in the Federal Government as would encourage sound programs of education in the States. I am also sending copies to the two chairmen of the Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Office of Education, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND and Representative FRANK B. KEEFE.

Respectfully yours.

CONGRESS CAN PREVENT FURTHER DANGEROUS INFLATION—OR DISASTROUS DEFLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members, I was in hope this extra session of Congress would not be called.

But we are here now, and faced with one of the gravest responsibilities that has ever rested upon the American Congress.

This dilly-dallying around, trying to stir up trouble for the white people of the Southern States, instead of passing the legislation that is necessary to save this country from disaster, is like Nero's fiddling while Rome burned.

We are faced with the most dangerous economic situation that ever confronted this country, and that is disastrous inflation or the greater calamity of a precipitate deflation, such as we had in 1921 and in 1929.

There is one way, and one way only, in which both of these disasters can be prevented. Prices in a free economy are governed by two things: The volume of the nation's currency and the velocity of its circulation. Today we have the greatest volume of currency and the most rapid velocity of circulation this country has ever known.

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof."

The Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses can prevent unlimited inflation, or disastrous deflation, by bringing out and passing a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act by placing a floor beneath which the currency cannot be deflated and a ceiling above which it cannot be inflated, and also providing that if these reserve banks undertake to do what they did in 1921 and in 1929, deflate the currency below the danger point, then the Government can issue United States notes, just as Abraham Lincoln did during the War Between the States—except that we would put a gold reserve behind it—and guarantee to the American people that there will not be a spiraling of runaway inflation, or another disastrous depression.

This is the most serious and pressing problem with which the country is confronted.

Congress should act now.

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

TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from further consideration of S. 866.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman for that purpose. The majority leader has already stated that there will be no suspensions today; and, under the practice of the House, suspensions must be cleared through the majority leader. The gentlewoman is not recognized for that purpose.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Under paragraph 1 of rule XXVII it is in order, is it not, for the Speaker to entertain a motion to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER. Yes, it is within the discretion of the Speaker, and the Speaker states that he will not recognize any Member for that purpose without clearing it through the majority leader, and using that discretion merely refuses to recognize the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Today is the first Monday in August, and under the aforementioned rule individual Members may move to suspend the rules and pass important legislation. Do I understand clearly then that the Chair is exercising his discretion in denying the House to vote on the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, even under the procedure requiring a two-thirds vote of the Members present?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the rule has existed for more than 50 years, and in accordance with the procedure which has been followed by not only the present Speaker but every other Speaker, the Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman from California for that purpose.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 866.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman for that purpose.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION AT MIDYEAR 1948—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1948.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a midyear economic report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the economic

report of the President of January 14, 1948, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, The Economic Situation at Midyear 1948, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I was home over the week end, to find myself confronted with a real problem. My wife had been trying to get a plumber all week. So I tried, and I tried four different plumbers, and I could not get a plumber. She tried to get an electrician, and I tried two electricians but could not get one. She wanted a carpenter, and I could not get a carpenter. I am afraid if I had called a painter or plasterer I would have had the same experience.

Will someone tell me how I can get an electrician, a plumber, or a carpenter? I need one. They are all so busy on new construction around Cleveland that they are not available for ordinary service calls.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I can tell the gentleman exactly how he can get one. Just have another Republican depression, when all the people are out of work, and we will get plenty of them.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure that the gentleman from Texas knows more about depressions than any of us Republicans. His party found a hole in the ground and by the time they finished they made it deeper than the Grand Canyon. It was deep enough to handle all the pigs and potatoes they plowed under for a dozen years.

The reason why I could not get a plumber or an electrician was just this—they were all working on private construction jobs—putting up buildings too expensive for the folks who need them most. There are 5,298 new homes going up in my community—most of them are between ten and fifteen thousand dollars. Veterans just getting started in life cannot afford these houses. The result is that we are putting up new places that folks cannot live in and you cannot get people to repair the ones that folks must live in.

INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7062) to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state a pertinent parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under paragraph 1 of rule 27——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already answered that inquiry, as submitted by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the civil-rights program. Ever since I came to Congress I have been one of the most active opponents of the things included in the President's so-called civil-rights program.

While there are other points in the civil-rights program, the most controversial are: First, the enactment by Congress of an antilynching law; second, Federal legislation to abolish the poll tax; third, Federal legislation to eliminate segregation; fourth, passage of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act.

These proposals, first, violate the Consitution; second, are an encroachment on States' rights; third, are wrong in principle; and, fourth, will not work in practice.

The program was inspired by agitators who want to make the South a political whipping boy. Not all who favor the civil-rights program are Communists, but it is certainly true that all who are Communists do favor it. They have now set up Henry Wallace as their straw man spokesman. They use him to help create prejudice and confusion for their own ends.

The program seeks to establish racial and social equality where none was decreed by the laws of God. Enactment of such proposals into law would add chaos to the already existing confusion in the national picture at a time when all of our energies should be devoted to a solution of problems of the greatest magnitude, both at home and abroad. All of those proposals have a political inspiration, which seeks the votes of the minority groups in the big cities of the North and East in order to perpetuate their sponsors in office. They are an invasion of the principles of States' rights as conceived by that great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, and followed through the years by those of us who cling to Jeffersonian principles.

There is no need for such legislation because the history of the progress of racial relationships in the South, where such problems are said to be acute, reveals that much has been done to solve them. The Negro has no better friend than the southern white man. We give him work to earn his livelihood. We feed and clothe him when he cannot provide for himself. We supply him with medical care and drugs when he is ill. We provide educational facilities for his children, contribute to the construction of his churches, advise with him when he is troubled. His progress has been remarkable in the last 80 years. All of that is contrasted with the treatment the Negro receives in the North where none save his own kind cares what becomes of him.

So much controversy has arisen over the Truman civil-rights program that it might shed some light on the subject to review its history briefly. The civil-rights doctrine originated in the minds of a few misguided zealots, whose clamorings to get political recognition from certain minority groups resulted in the establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission by Executive order in 1941. More will be said about that later.

The first major step in the formation of the civil-rights program occurred when President Truman appointed a Committee on Civil Rights in December 1946. After more than a year that committee submitted a 178-page document which serves as a basis for the program.

In his state-of-the-Union message delivered to Congress January 7, 1948, the President discussed, among other things, the question of so-called civil rights, and stated he would send a special message to the Congress on that subject.

On February 2, 1948, the President sent the special message.

The civil-rights program became a major point of controversy at the Democratic National Convention in July 1948, and split the Democratic Party into segments. Its submission as a subject to be considered by the Congress at this special session has resulted in a situation that has delayed consideration of important legislation in the other body.

Let me discuss each of the four mentioned proposals briefly:

First. Antilynching.

The record of lynchings in the United States during the past 50 years shows in 1900 there were 115; in 1910, 76; in 1920, 61; in 1930, 21; in 1940, 5; 1944, 2; 1945, 1; 1946, 6; 1947, again only 1 lynching. The figures show that lynching has practically disappeared in America without a Federal antilynching law. Therefore, there is no need for such a Federal statute.

On the other hand, the vociferous advocates of an antilynching law make no suggestion that there be a Federal statute enacted against murder, rape, robbery, theft, burglary, and so forth.

In New York City, where a large part of the agitation for a Federal antilynching law comes from, in 1946 there were 325 murders, 14,525 other felonies, and a total of 697,734 crimes reported to the police. That is the record of one city in 1 year. Yet among the 140,000,000 people in the entire United States there were only 6 lynchings.

Lynching is another form of murder and is prohibited by statute in every State in the United States. Why do not the advocates of an antilynching law seek Federal legislation to punish the commission of other forms of murder and other felonies? Obviously, in view of the record of New York City and other metropolitan centers in the United States, the crimes are so commonplace there is no vote-getting glamour in seeking Federal statutes for the punishment

of crimes generally. Equally obviously, the demand is raised all out of proportion to the justification, based on the record that lynching has almost entirely disappeared in this country.

Do not those victims of murder, robbery, rape, and so forth, have some civil rights? Certainly. Again, they have no spokesman for their rights seeking the enactment of Federal laws for punishment of the offenders, because there is no political benefit accruing from such a program.

Second. Abolition of the poll tax.

Only 7 States in the 48 levy a poll tax as a means of registration to establish eligibility for voting. In many of them, including Texas, most of the revenue derived is devoted to the maintenance and operation of the public schools. If the people of Texas want to abolish the poll tax and substitute some other requisite to vote, that is their business; but I am opposed to the Federal Government telling Texas how and what to do about it.

A law enacted by Congress to abolish the poll tax is unconstitutional, in my opinion. The Constitution provides in article 1, section 2:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Numerous cases have been decided sustaining my viewpoint. In Breedlove against Suttles, decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1937, Mr. Justice Butler, speaking for the Court, said:

> Payment as a prerequisite is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. It does not limit the tax to electors; aliens are not there permitted to vote, but the tax is laid upon them, if within the defined class. It is not laid upon persons 60 or more years old, whether electors or not. Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the State's power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution.

Other cases have followed the principle announced in that case.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly, I yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. I want to pay my respects to the gentleman from Texas for the fight he has made on the floor of this House for constitutional government. I also want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine attendance record he has had in the last session of the Congress. I understand he is one of the few Members of this body who has a perfect attendance record.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman.

Enactment by Congress of a law to abolish the poll tax would be an invasion of the rights of the States to establish their own electoral systems.

The poll-tax issue is another one of those that is raised for pure vote-getting purposes by those in the North and East who are agitating for a Federal law on the subject. The issue is politically inspired to get the votes of a minority group in the big city areas in doubtful States. That is where the cry to abolish the poll tax comes from.

I could go on at length discussing this subject but to do so would unduly burden you. Let me direct your attention to the fact that I led the debate on the floor of the House in opposition to the proposal on July 21, 1947, when that subject was up for consideration. The speech I made on that occasion in opposition to the legislation contains a full analysis of my views on the subject and the law in support of my position.

Third. Federal legislation to eliminate segregation.

Segregation is not discrimination. It is a means of affording people of all races an opportunity to be and associate with their own kind. It avoids friction. It promotes harmonious relationships. It prevents discord. It eliminates opportunities for disagreement and strife.

What does elimination of segregation by law mean to the average citizen? It means that the American would be prohibited from choosing his associates in the church, in the school, in fraternal organization, in every walk of social life. It means that you and I must accept as associates in our daily lives persons of race and color other than our own regardless of our personal feelings in the matter. In order to eliminate segregation and to prevent discrimination it would result in the establishment of a Federal bureau with gestapo powers. The employees of such an agency would have a right to tell the free American citizen with whom he could associate regardless of the citizen's personal desires in the matter. Carried to its ultimate conclusion, the agents of such a bureau could require the churches to accept membership from those it did not want. It could compel us to send our children to school with companions other than their own seeking. It could require us to occupy the same travel accommodations, the same hotels, and eat at the same restaurants in company of persons we did not voluntarily choose.

All of those things could be done in the name of civil rights. To do them would be to disregard the rights of a majority of the people.

Fourth. The FEPC.

The establishment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission by law to prohibit discrimination in private employment would be a terrible imposition on the American people. It would simply mean this: that no employer could employ or discharge persons from employment without being supervised by agents of that bureau. It would mean that the employee would be required to work side by side with individuals he would not associate with except by compulsion. Assume 75 percent of the population in a given town were white and 25 percent black. Under such a law every employer would have to accept one-fourth of his employees from among the colored race regardless of the nature and type of employment. If a merchant had four clerks, one of them would have to be a Negro. If a contractor wanted to hire four carpenters, one of them would have to be a Negro. If a board of school trustees wanted to employ four teachers, one of them would have to be a Negro.

Illustrations of this nature could be noted in countless numbers.

We have a history in the establishment of an FEPC. In 1941, by Executive order, the President of the United States established an FEPC. That organization was broadened and enlarged in scope and number of employees during the ensuing years. In 1944 it employed more Negroes than whites; had Negroes supervising white employees within the agency; paid the Negroes an aggregate salary larger than it paid the white employees; required employees of the agency to use the same rest-room facilities regardless of their race; ordered the railroads of the Nation to employ Negroes indiscriminately as engineers, firemen, and conductors regardless of qualifications. The activities of that Commission resulted in strikes, riots, and other friction between whites and Negroes of this country.

That agency existed when I took the oath of office as Congressman in 1945. One of the first things I did as a new Congressman was to call together a group of other new Members to discuss ways and means to eliminate the FEPC. As a result, we set upon a course to do everything possible to prevent further enlargement of that bureau and to eliminate it as soon as possible. Those of us who opposed the continuation of the FEPC were continually devising ways and means to destroy it.

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

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman knows something of my very high appreciation of him as a public servant and of the fine service he has rendered here as a Member of this House. May I say to the gentleman, however, that I particularly appreciate the work he has done toward stopping the FEPC, which, if it should ever become law, will paralyze the industry of this country, because the act itself is a drive against the institution of private property. I do not believe there is any Member of the House who has contributed more to the resistance of that measure than the gentleman who now addresses this body.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

The chance to kill the FEPC came during my first term in Congress. H. R. 5890, a bill to make appropriations for certain agencies of the Government, was called up on the floor of the House for consideration. The bill provided for money to continue the FEPC to the end of the fiscal year. I made the point of order that struck that sum of money from the bill and forced the agency out of existence. It has not been revived since.

My record of opposition to the proposals in the civil rights program is well known to all Members of this House and to all others who have been regular readers of the newspapers. I have helped arrange and attended many meetings in protest of specific proposals in the civil rights program. On the numerous occasions when Members of the House, such as Messrs. MARCANTONIO, ISACSON, and

POWELL, offered amendments to various bills seeking to write into those bills language in keeping with the civil rights program, I have always been on the floor and active in my opposition to their amendments. I have been instrumental in notifying other Members what was taking place and getting them to vote against those amendments. As a result of our concerted activities no such proposal has been enacted into law in the last 4 years.

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

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. As chairman of a group of 78 southern Congressmen who have organized to fight the so-called civil rights program, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for having helped set up our organization and for the effective service he has rendered.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I was one of the 78 Members of the House who formed an organization to oppose actively the President's civil-rights program after he delivered his message to the Congress on February 2 of this year. I feel that our opposition in the past has been effective in preventing enactment into law of any of the legislation sought to be adopted. I expect to continue my opposition to such a program as long as I am in Congress and afterward so long as I am able to oppose it.

Let me call your attention to the slogan of those who foment this civil-rights hysteria, "equality." One of the great purposes of the Constitution was to secure the blessings of liberty so that men could be free to be different and realize their differing ambitions with their differing abilities; not to achieve an impossible equality among unequal human beings. Every proposal seeking to give a man a right to do something which as a freeman he cannot secure for himself, results in imposing burdens and restraints on the freedoms of others. We must watch and defeat every effort to create by law the right in one man to compel others to associate with him or accept obligations to him in the realm of private enterprise and private life. We must realize that freedom of association in work and in leisure is one of our most precious liberties.

Let us recall the words of the late Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Brandeis, whom no one could rightfully accuse of intolerance or prejudice. He wrote:

> The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.

To sum it up, in the name of civil rights the proponents of this program would violate the very fundamentals of the Bill of Rights and force on the individual an association with persons and conditions of living not of his own choosing. In short, it would deprive the individual of his right to live under his own vine and fig tree in his own way. These things he would have to surrender to bureaucratic control and dictation from Washington, where some Government agent could tell him whom he should employ, what he could do and with whom he must associate. Thus, in the name of civil rights they would destroy the very liberties upon which this Government was founded and under which it has grown to be the mightiest nation in the history of the world.

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

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating the gentleman on the splendid speech he has made and I also want to join them in saying that I know of no Member of the House who has been more diligent and more sincere in his fight for the preservation of American and southern institutions than he has been. I want to repeat what the gentleman said in the first part of his speech to the effect that the Negroes have made great progress in the South and at this time call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the progress the Negroes have made in the South has been due to the aid and understanding of the white man of the South, that it is due in no way to these paid political agitators of the North and East who are trying to destroy constitutional democratic American Government.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I reiterate with all of the emphasis at my command, I have opposed the civil-rights program. I am now opposed to the program. I will continue my opposition to that program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles by Samuel B. Pettengill.

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CURE FOR HIGH PRICES UP TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the great peril confronting this country is inflation; high prices follow in its wake. Inflation can be more devastating than war. This is no time for a dog fight between the President and Congress. The people are demanding that we get together. Our common enemy is inflation and economic chaos will result if we take no steps to arrest it. We faced an enemy in 1941 as a united people and achieved a great military victory. We did not consider the problem as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans. We cannot win the economic battle as partisans; it must and will be won as Americans without reference to politics.

The moment has arrived for our leaders to sit down together and make an effort to solve the problem jointly. Why jockey for political position when the economic welfare of all the people of this great Nation is at stake? And let us not be too much concerned about who is to get credit. There will be plenty of it for both political parties and you can bet that the people will know who is responsible.

There has been considerable talk in and out of Congress about high prices; many charges and countercharges have been made as to the responsibility for the present situation; there has been a lot of name calling. However, two facts stand out: One, That prices continue to rise as dollars multiply in a market where production cannot keep up with demand; and, two, that there are some areas of agreement and the people are asking the President and Congress to get together.

On the part of the Congress its responsibility is to consider the President's request in a spirit of fair play and within its jurisdiction. It is the duty of the President to represent all of the people in an effort to solve the problem on the basis of economics and not politics. There is something more important than securing political office and that is the protection and security of our people under a free economy. The whole world looks to us for assistance. If inflation destroys our economy, socialism and communism will take over.

The root cause of the continuing price rise is the inflation of money. Our money supply was greatly expanded during the war and even since the war it has continued to increase out of all proportion to production. Figures indicate that up to the first of this year the supply of money is three times that of 1939 or up 200 percent, while the supply of goods to be purchased with that money is up only 71 percent. So the immediate job before us is to cut down the accelerating supply of money. How can this be done?

Drastically reduce Government spending. The President can, on his own order, stop the flow of free and easy money that Government has been pumping into our economic system—before the war, during the war, and since the war. Last January he submitted the biggest peacetime budget in the history of this country and he was highly critical of a Republican Congress that tried to cut it.

Mr. President, here is a challenge, Congress is not interested in your recommendations that call for the spending of more billions of dollars. It is greatly concerned about the continued rise in prices and in the shortage of housing. But you, Mr. President, can immediately stabilize the price situation by:

First. Reduce the foreign aid spending program temporarily.

Second. Slow down the armaments program.

Third. Halt Government employment and reduce the pay rolls by 500,000.

Fourth. Delay enforcement of the draft law until 1949.

Fifth. Stop all Government spending except for absolute essentials.

Here are just a few of the things that you can do, Mr. President, to stop the spiral of inflation if you are sincere in your statements about reducing high prices. Free and easy money policies of the administration have brought on the present extraordinary occasion.

The President knows that while he spends billions for armaments, billions for foreign aid, increases Federal employment, and authorizes the shipment of needed commodities abroad, prices will continue to rise. We must achieve a balance between money and goods. Under existing policies it is difficult to see how this can be done. In good conscience the President cannot take credit for high wages and big profits and at the same time charge that this condition has created an "extraordinary occasion" that requires the Congress to convene in special session.

Congress, too, has some responsibility and it should act to curb credits and require that banks increase reserves. In fact it should apply brakes wherever it deems it necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week end the newspapers carried streamer headlines, "Treasury and Commerce Department still harboring Red spies" and "Representative REES to name U. S. workers 'who ought to be fired'" and "Two high officials accused as aides of Red spies," with their alarming revelations.

But before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, I want the Members to know that there is one department in which the known or reasonably suspected subversives, Communists, fellow travelers, sympathizers, and persons whose services are not for the best interests of the United States, have been swept out. That is the Department of State. For this job the people of the United States can thank to a great extent, in the order in which the work was done: First, Congressman BARTEL J. JONKMAN, of the Fifth District of Michigan, who on July 10, 1946, was appointed a committee of one—from the Committee on Foreign Affairs—to investigate communism in the State Department; second, the people themselves, who on November 5, 1946, elected a Republican Congress, and third, Mr. John E. Peurifoy who, after that election, was appointed to the office of Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, which includes hiring and firing of personnel, on January 23, 1947. Since the date Mr. Peurifoy took charge of that office 134 such persons were either separated from the Department or separated themselves from the Department, so that, Mr. Peurifoy tells me, the Department of State is now free from persons of whom it is known or there is reasonable cause to believe that they are security risks.

Before Mr. Peurifoy took office the previous administration had discharged only one such person and that was also after the aforesaid election, when the old administration apparently became panicky because of the oncoming Republican Congress. They had known practically all the facts on this person and his dismissal had been recommended 8 months before.

A short review of the history of this cleaning-out process, I think should be made for the record.

On July 10, 1946, when I was appointed a committee of one, I made inquiry outside of the State Department as to persons within it whose alleged affiliations or sympathies with Communists might make them a security risk. Within 24 hours I had a list of 35. I then called the State Department and made an appointment for the next day at my office.

The then Deputy Assistant Secretary Panuch told me at that meeting that 79 employees had been discharged, 26 as aliens, 13 for not having 15 years of citizenship, and 40 for being security risks or pinks and reds, as he called them. At the end of this meeting, however, on incisive questioning he admitted that some of the 40 might have been fired for mere incompetence, but he was unable to give the number of each. I requested a letter giving me a break-down which he promised. In 2 days I received his letter with a lot of unrelated, useless information, but not a word on the 40 persons discharged.

I immediately called him on the telephone, told him of the evasion and said, "I'll be in your office at 10 tomorrow morning and I want to see those files of the persons discharged." He answered they were secret, private files, and I would not be permitted to see them. I retorted, "I'll be there at 10 and will discuss that then." I was at his office at 10 and a half dozen files were lying ready for me, including one on Carl A. Marzani. All of these names I had on my list of 35. These files had been prepared by a security committee of six persons chosen for that purpose from within the Department. This committee had recommended in March—4 months before—that five be discharged and one cleared. I asked, "Why have not the five been fired?" and as to the one that was cleared I am not quarreling with the result, but you proceed on the policy that the danger of a security risk must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. You give the employee the benefit of the doubt. That is a dangerous policy for the safety of 145,000,000 people.

In other words, your policy should be that if there is reasonable cause to believe that an employee is a security risk he should be separated at once unless the Secretary of State himself, in writing, overrides the verdict and orders his retention. That would be giving the Government the benefit of the doubt and a sound policy. But again why haven't these five been fired 4 months ago? His answer was that they were entitled to an examination by the civil-service board before they could be discharged. I answered, you have never submitted their names to the Civil Service Commission, but under the McCarran law recently passed that is unnecessary and the Secretary of State, regardless of the civil-service laws, can discharge any person in the Department whenever he deemed that such person's services are not for the best interests of the United States. He countered that this law was unconstitutional. I think I convinced him that the law was constitutional, but did convince him that it was not for him as an administrative officer to raise that question, especially when the security of 145,000,000 people might be at stake.

But, I said in the same breath, "I'll just have to report that you are ignoring the law because of its unconstitutionalty, and now I want to see the files of the 40 or those of them that you did discharge as security risks." Then the Deputy Secretary broke down completely and admitted that there was not even one that had been fired for security-risk reasons and he said, in the same breath, "but I will go along with you on the policy of giving the Government the benefit of the doubt if you will keep the list of names secret; I'll fire Carl Marzani and Mr. X tomorrow and the others in due course if you will keep the names secret so we can fire them under the provisions of the McCarran law." I at first hesitated, but finally agreed. I did examine more files and found that about 40 had been recommended for dismissal, including nearly all of the 35 on my list, but, of course, no one had actually been dismissed.

Did Deputy Administrator Panuch fire Marzani on the morrow? No; he did not.

I inquired on the third day and while I could not reach Mr. Panuch, nor his chief, Mr. Russell, I was informed nothing had been done. It later developed on the trial of Marzani, hereafter referred to, that, instead, he told Marzani that as long as he, Panuch, and Russell were in charge he, Marzani, was O. K. Be that as it may, I immediately realized that I had only a deputy assistant secretary's promises and that he might just have been playing horse with me to get out of a tight spot. So, on July 18 I addressed a letter to Secretary James F. Byrnes, stating the deplorable condition in the Department with reference to these security risks, the dire need of a policy along the lines I had indicated and requested an immediate answer as to what he was going to do about it.

His response was a long distance telephone call from, I think it was Ocean City. He said my letter had been read to him over the telephone and was an education to him and he had been in Paris and did not know of the alleged subversives in his department, or the McCarran law, but if I would hold off until Monday—this was Friday—he would be back in Washington and make this matter his first order of business. I said, "I certainly hope you will, and I'll play along, but, Mr. Secretary, the situation is terrible and I sure hope you will act on Monday without fail." He then made this revealing reply, "Well, you must know, Congressman, that it is a difficult matter to do wholesale firing of

people merely because they belong to what is here a minority party when that same party is the sole and dominant party of a great country with which I have serious and difficult diplomatic negotiations." My reply to that is immaterial. Official Washington was astounded when I publicized this statement. Suffice it to say that on Monday, Tuesday, and so forth, nothing was done.

On the 29th day of July I received a bland letter from Assistant Secretary Russell that certainly I would not want them to use gestapo methods. This was just 4 days before Congress was to adjourn. I realized that they realized that the New Deal was in control of the Congress, of the Supreme Court, as well as the executive branch. The New Dealers in the State Department were riding high and apparently laughing at a lone Republican Congressman, acting as a committee of one, worrying about the security of the country. When I reported to the Committee on Foreign Affairs a high-ranking member said, "Congressman JONKMAN has done more effective work in 3 weeks without a dollar of expense money than some large committees with substantial appropriations have accomplished in 3 years."

But, my friends, while I had succeeded in exposing a deplorable condition, I had failed to eliminate a single person, even Carl Marzani, from the Department. After this report, realizing that vital statements such as of Secretary Byrnes, above, and a few others, should have more proof than my word against his, I, on August 2, wrote a letter to the Department saying that such statements had been made and were probably the cause of nonaction, to see if they would deny them. But the answer came back baldly, without denial of such statements, that upon sufficient proof they would take action, but certainly I would not want them to use gestapo methods. This was on August 9, after Congress had adjourned, and about the same time I read in the newspapers that the Department had fired the Americans on guard, the Security Committee, instead of firing a single Red.

Now comes the second act in the drama. On November 5 the people of the United States elected a Republican Congress. Immediately there was consternation and hysteria among the New Dealers in the Department. Marzani was called in by Panuch and asked to resign. But Marzani would not resign. He was told, "We've got this d—n congressional pressure on us," and "it's just this congressional pressure," and "with a Republican Congress there's going to be trouble." But Marzani would not resign. So on December 20, just before the Republican Eightieth Congress convened, he was not only fired under the McCarran Act, but indicted for having falsely sworn that he was not a Communist, and later was duly convicted. All the facts of his conviction were there or deducible from the report I had read in July and which, as I said before, was 4 months old. If the people had not elected a Republican Congress, the State Department would probably still be giving me the horse laugh. When action to serve the people and our security was needed in March and July there was no response, but in December there was plenty of action for their own security. In fact, they overdid it, but in just one spot.

It is significant that when Secretary Byrnes was replaced by General Marshall as Secretary of State the following January, Russell and Panuch resigned with Byrnes.

Immediately upon the appointment of Secretary Marshall, or to be exact, 2 days later upon the appointment of John E. Peurifoy as Acting Assistant Secretary—he was later made Assistant Secretary—I went to see General Marshall with Congressman MUNDT, of South Dakota, and asked him what the policy would be and started to give Secretary Marshall the history. Mr. Peurifoy was there. Soon Marshall said, "I'm familiar with these facts, Mr. JONKMAN, and I am going to give Mr. Peurifoy instructions in your presence that I am in favor of the policy you have advocated. I am giving him instructions in your presence that if there is reasonable cause to believe that anybody in the State Department is a security risk I want the Government to have the benefit of the doubt and have such person discharged and he does not have to come back to me for further instructions. It is his responsibility from now on."

So John Peurifoy took on the third act in the drama on January 23 and he has done a grand job. I know that he has the respect and confidence on both sides of the aisle. There may have been an occasional difference with his judgment. After all his is a most difficult task. He cannot proceed on suspicion, rumor, hearsay, or innuendo. On the other hand he must act on reasonable cause for belief. On this minds may differ. I have found him to use sound discretion and judgment. Most of the persons I had on that original list have been eliminated. A few have been retained. But, as I said in the beginning, in all he has patiently but persistently cleaned 134 security risks out of the Department. In addition to that many new applicants constituting security risks have been kept from getting into the Department. Mr. Peurifoy informed me last week that the Department is now free from known or reasonably suspected risks. I wish we had a John Peurifoy in every branch and agency of the Government with delegated powers such as Secretary Marshall gave him. Then we would see a far more thorough house cleaning than will come from the President's $25,000,000 loyalty program.

I want to say that I go home from the Eightieth Congress with far more confidence in the personnel of the State Department than I did from the Seventy-ninth Congress 2 years ago. About the only bad taste I have is a libel suit for a half a million dollars started by Mr. Panuch against the Times-Herald and myself. That does not worry me except that it costs money to hire defense lawyers. But even that is a trifle to the pleasure of writing finis to the job assigned to me as a committee of one over 2 years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CONGRESS CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT INFLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the lack of action taken by the Congress in relation to the needs of the American people. There has been too much hysteria, personal recriminations, and politics and not enough effort to try and do something tangible about the high cost of living.

With steel, paper, meat, cement, cigarettes, and many other prices going up we do nothing but talk and blame one another for the present precarious situation. Talk and inaction have never yet solved a problem. The time for positive action is now and the people are looking to us as their duly-elected Representatives to help them in their distress.

I do not know the complete answer to the problem of inflation but there are two steps which I think this special session should consider. One is to restore regulation W to curb consumer credit and to cut down the tremendous and dangerous overexpansion in this field.

As everyone here will recall regulation W was abolished by an act of Congress and signed by the President under Public Law 386 on August 8, 1947. Since then, the Senate of the United States has passed in renewed form regulation W and it is now—and has been for some time—in the House Banking and Currency Committee. I think it imperative that this measure be considered and I call upon the Banking and Currency Committee to report it out to us at the earliest moment.

The other step is to hold hearings on the O'Mahoney-Mansfield measure which has been introduced in the Senate and House and is known as H. R. 7076 in this body. Under this bill, a cooling-off period of 30 days would become mandatory for the large corporations before they could raise prices. In this period, the corporations would have to appear publicly before the Federal Trade Commission and prove that the contemplated price raises are necessary. As everyone knows, the steel industry recently raised its price on steel over $9 a ton. This, in turn, will be reflected in increased prices for cars, refrigerators, building materials, and many other items and the net result will be to further boost the spiral of inflation.

These are extraordinary times. With the United States Government spending billions on an armaments program, more billions for foreign aid, thus draining goods out of this country, there is little opportunity for the operation of a free law of supply and demand. Such a situation calls for governmental assistance at this time so that scarce materials can be allocated and so that continual and unnecessary price raises by big corporations can be stopped.

It does not make any difference now who, if anybody, is responsible for higher prices for the farmer, higher wages for some of the workers, or higher profits for the large corporations. Calling each other names and blaming the other political party does no one any good but only helps to make a bad situation worse. It is time for this Congress to forget party labels and to bend its collective ability to the task of tackling an onerous job and to stay in session until we come up with a workable solution to the high-cost-of-living problem.

By our actions to date and the talk of an adjournment by August 7 this Congress is making a sorry spectacle of itself. The people will not be fooled by the play acting we are going through nor will they be happy over the carefully arranged, predetermined anti-poll-tax show being put on by the actors in the other body.

The people of the United States know what is going on and this Congress in trying to fool them is only fooling itself. The people know what they are paying for meat, milk, cars, cigarettes, canned goods, refrigerators, and all the other things they must have to live. They hear the Congress talk, talk, and talk and they feel their pockets, look at their shrinking bank accounts, notice how their bonds are being cashed in, and ponder over their bills as they become due. Then there are the people whose incomes are below a livable minimum and the people living on fixed incomes, annuities, and pensions. What are they saying, what are they contemplating doing, what are they thinking?

The people know all the facts about the high cost of living because they cannot escape them. All our double talk about stabilizing the debt and the dollar, trade balances and export controls, and raising the bank reserves and rediscount rates means nothing to the people who are trying desperately to make both ends meet. What does mean something to them is meat at $1 a pound, cigarettes at 20 cents, $5,000 houses at $11,000 or more, and all the other items they must or should have. These people, our constituents, are watching to see what we will do in their behalf. They are watching this Congress as they never have watched another one. They know—if some Members of this body do not—that their responsibility for what we do or do not do begins on our adjournment and their decision will be made on November 2, 1948. A do-nothing Congress will then get what it deserves and a do-something Congress will get what it merits.

Both the Congress and the President are partially to blame for the present inflation—but only partially. The real cause of our present difficulty lies in the cost of financing a world war. We increased our debt during the war from approximately $40,000,000,000 to approximately $300,000,000,000. This was necessary to buy the material to support our armies, navies, and air force all over the world. The colossal sums needed could not be raised by taxation. Had that been possible, there would be no inflation today. If the bonds could have been sold directly to the people inflation probably could have been avoided but that, too, was impossible. Most of the money was raised by selling bonds to our banks and the result was a flood of printing-press money. We paid huge sums to keep our war economy going but we manufactured a bare minimum of civilian consumer goods. With the great money supply and a lack of civilian goods to spend it on the result was a mild inflation which only controls kept in line.

When controls were abandoned—and both the President and the Congress were to blame—inflation really set in and has been traveling upward at a dizzy pace since. The same thing happened, to a lesser degree, after World War I and was eventually followed by deflation. The pattern, after both World Wars, is essentially the same, but the effects this time are far greater and potentially more destructive.

The fate of our own country, as well as the world, may lie in the balance. Economic stability here will be of tremendous value to the rest of the globe in its efforts to achieve a sound economic base which will give strength to governments and security to their peoples. If inflation really develops into a "bust" here—as Marriner Eccles has stated it would—we will, in an era of full employment, have laid the ground work for conditions far worse than they were in the 1930's.

Mr. Speaker, the facts pertaining to our economy today are startling. According to the July 1948 issue of "Economic Indicators" published by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report it is stated that:

First. In 1939, corporate profits after taxes, were $5,000,000,000, in the first quarter of this year at an annual rate of $19,700,000,000, an increase of $14,700,000,000 or 294 percent. In 1939 compensation of employees was $47,800,000,000, and in the second quarter of this year at an annual rate of $134,500,000,000 or 181.4 percent increase.

Second. Corporate dividend payments were in 1939, $3,800,000,000 and the first quarter of this year, at a rate of $7,500,000,000, or nearly twice as much, but in 1939, undistributed profits were only $1,200,000,000, and in the first quarter this year, at the rate of $12,200,000,000 or more than 10 times as large as in 1939.

Third. In 1939 employees' compensation was 66 percent of national income; in 1947, 63 percent, and in the second quarter of this year at the annual rate of only 61.7 percent.

Fourth. Consumer credit outstanding was in May this year 6.3 percent of national income compared with 5.7 percent in 1946. Consumer credit outstanding, increased $3,600,000,000 from December 1946 to $13,800,000,000 in May 1948, and is rapidly mounting.

Fifth. Proprietors' and rental income jumped from $14,700,000,000 in 1939 to an annual rate of $53,600,000,000 in the second quarter of this year, an increase of $38,900,000,000 or almost 265 percent.

Sixth. Taking consumers' prices from 1935–39 as 100, in May this year, prices of all items compiled by the Department of Labor for moderate income families in large cities, were 170.5; for food 210.9; for clothing 197.5 and rents were 116.7.

Seventh. In 1946 average family money income before taxes was: Lowest income fifth, $835, second fifth, $2,023, third fifth, $3,050, fourth fifth, $4,201, highest fifth, $8,921.

Eighth. Average weekly earnings in May of this year were $51.98 in manufacturing, while in April they were $38.40 in retail trade; $49.33 in bituminous coal mining, and $67.58 in private building construction.

The Federal Reserve Board reports that about 3,000,000 spending units who had savings January 1, 1947, had none by New Year's this year, and a quarter of consumers spent more than their income last year.

In addition to the facts and figures already given I should like to call attention to a survey made by United Industrial Associates, Inc., of Washington, D. C. This survey was undertaken by a private firm of consulting engineers and was published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press under date of July 26, 1948. With building costs increasing, with veterans in Montana and elsewhere finding it extremely difficult to get GI loans—which the Government guarantees up to $4,000—from the banks, this survey presents a startling picture. There are too many veterans and too many low-income families affected by the housing shortage and it is necessary, in my opinion, that the Congress consider this question quickly and objectively. We all know what the effects of living in overcrowded, unhealthy, and limited quarters will be. We all know what tensions can arise from living with relatives. We all know that if housing conditions and shortages are not corrected that crime, juvenile delinquency, disease, and broken families will result. The future of America lies in our homes and there is no reason why Government and business, working together, cannot arrive at a sensible solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the survey referred to follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of July 26, 1948]

HOME PRICES AT NEW HIGH: $4,599 HOUSE IN 1939 NOW $11,094

WASHINGTON.—The price of homes in the United States reached a new high in June, a survey by a private firm of consulting engineers showed Sunday night.

United Industrial Associates, Inc., of Washington, revealed the results of what it said was the latest in a series of surveys it has made on housing prices.

These figures show that the price tag on the average house and lot in June was $11,094, compared with $9,749 a year ago and $4,599 in 1939.

The firm emphasized that its figures were the prices of homes, not construction costs.

"New houses represent only a fraction of the total houses sold in the market, and builders sell their new houses at the market price rather than the cost of construction," the firm said.

In June, the firm said, housing prices were highest in Los Angeles, Calif., Chicago, New York, and Boston, where the average is now $13,000.

"Kansas City, Mo., is the only remaining city where an average house can be bought for less than $7,000," the firm said. The firm gave these figures on its survey:

City	June 1939	June 1947	June 1948	Percent increase since June 1947
Boston	$5,558	$12,300	$13,612	10.7
Chicago	5,232	11,350	13,114	15.5
Cincinnati	5,037	9,527	10,120	6.2
Detroit	4,445	7,549	8,393	11.2
Indianapolis	3,110	6,236	7,684	23.2
Kansas City, Mo	2,511	5,648	6,505	15.2
Milwaukee	4,373	8,763	10,157	15.9
St. Paul-Minneapolis	3,526	7,918	9,036	14.1
New York City	6,000	11,479	13,391	16.7
St. Louis	2,942	5,780	7,752	34.1
San Francisco	4,210	9,979	10,928	9.5
Washington	5,835	11,357	12,352	8.8
National average	4,599	9,749	11,094	14.5

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks an article entitled "About Terms for GI Home Loans" taken from the United States News and World Report of August 6, 1948:

ABOUT TERMS FOR GI HOME LOANS

Tightening of mortgage credit is making it harder for veterans to get loans for buying or building homes. Banks and other lending institutions are making fewer insured or guaranteed loans to veterans. In addition, larger down payments are being demanded. This is partly because of relatively low interest rates involved, and partly because of the difficulty of disposing of these mortgages through secondary mortgage markets.

A number of veterans, however, are still succeeding in financing homes. Some of these are financed under the GI bill of rights, others through mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The Veterans' Administration is approving GI home loans at a rate of nearly 30,000 a month. This compares with a rate a year ago of about 51,000 a month. In addition, many veterans are getting homes entirely through private financing channels, without any assistance from the Government. These private lenders include savings and loan associations, insurance companies, banks, and other institutions.

IS CONGRESS MAKING IT EASIER FOR VETERANS TO GET LOANS?

Not at this time. In fact, Congress has made it harder in some ways for veterans to get home loans, by dropping title 6 of the National Housing Act. Under that title, no longer in effect, Government insurance of mortgages could be obtained under more favorable terms and up to 90 percent of the cost of homes.

WHAT HAS CONGRESS DONE TO EASE HOME-LOAN CREDIT?

Congress recently passed legislation designed to provide more financing for veterans' homes by restoring in the Government a secondary mortgage market for VA- and FHA-supported mortgages. This authorizes the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to buy some of these mortgages. But a number of restrictions are written around such purchases.

For one thing, a lending institution can sell to FNMA only 25 percent of its mortgages insured by VA or FHA since April 30, 1948. Thus, large amounts of old mortgages cannot be turned into cash to provide new loans. Big mortgages for apartments and rental developments cannot qualify for sale. And the mortgage holder must certify that each mortgage sold to FNMA covers houses that meet FHA building standards. Because of these and other restrictions, many lenders and veterans' groups say that this secondary market will be of little value in providing more credit for veterans' homes.

EVEN SO, CAN VETERANS GET HOME LOANS NOW?

Yes, if they can meet certain requirements. But veterans must show that they have wages or other income to enable them to meet monthly payments on loans.

WHERE DO VETERANS APPLY FOR LOANS?

A veteran wanting a home loan does not go directly to the Government. Instead, he goes to a bank, a savings and loan association, an insurance company, or some other lender. In some cases, the lender will agree to put up the money without Government backing. But, if not, two types of Government financing are available to qualified veterans who can get loans. One is a VA guaranty under the GI bill of rights, available only to veterans of World War II, and the other is FHA mortgage insurance, available to both veterans and nonveterans.

In many cases, lenders now are unwilling to make loans entirely under VA backing. Instead, they are demanding that part of veterans' mortgages be insured by FHA and the rest of it guaranteed by VA, with its lower interest rates.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INSURED AND GUARANTEED LOANS?

FHA operates a system under which it backs up a home loan through a mutual insurance system. That is, the borrower pays 4½ percent interest on the loan plus one-half of 1 percent as a mortgage-insurance premium. Any losses through defaults are paid off from this insurance fund, with no cost to the Government. But VA makes an outright guaranty of a certain share of a home loan that it backs. The borrower pays only 4 percent interest on this loan. Any loss resulting for the Government is paid out of the United States Treasury.

IS A DOWN PAYMENT ALWAYS REQUIRED?

The down payment is a matter that is worked out by the lender and the borrower. A year ago, it often was possible for a veteran to buy a home without any down payment. This usually involved the combined financing of VA and FHA. But, today, lenders almost invariably require veterans to make down payments.

UP TO HOW MUCH CAN BE BORROWED?

This varies in individual cases, and is decided by the lender. On a GI home loan, VA will guarantee up to 50 percent of the loan, with a limit of $4,000 to its guaranty. That is, it will back $3,500 of a $7,000 loan, but no more than $4,000 of a loan for more than $8,000.

FHA now will insure up to 80 percent of its valuation of a home, based upon long-term values instead of current costs. That means a limit of $8,000 on a house valued at $10,000 by FHA appraisers. Slightly larger insurance sometimes can be obtained on a new home approved by FHA before construction starts.

HOW LONG A TIME IS GIVEN TO REPAY?

In the majority of cases, VA and FHA loans must be repaid in full in 20 years, through fixed amounts of monthly payments. Some of these loans, however, can run for as long as 25 years.

HOW LARGE ARE MONTHLY PAYMENTS?

The payments, of course, vary according to the amount of the loan and the number of years that it runs. Take, for example, the case of a veteran buying a $12,000 home, with a $2,000 down payment. That would leave a mortgage of $10,000, to be paid off in, say, 20 years, on which the Veterans' Administration would place a guaranty of $4,000. The monthly payments of interest and repayment of principal would come to about $59 a month. This would not cover such things as insurance and taxes. If this same mortgage were insured in part or in full by FHA, the monthly carrying charge would be higher.

ON WHAT BASIS ARE APPRAISALS MADE?

For GI home loans guaranteed under the GI bill, appraisals must be made by persons approved by VA. These appraisers check to see that the costs of houses do not exceed what is considered their "reasonable value." Present high costs are taken into consideration in determining reasonable values.

FHA appraisers follow a different method when determining the amount of this agency's mortgage insurance. Until recently, FHA appraisals could take into consideration necessary current costs. But the authority to approve this type of loan, under title 6 of the National Housing Act, was not extended by Congress. So present appraisals must be based upon long-term values. This formula, however, has been eased somewhat to meet present conditions. FHA's appraisals put emphasis on economic soundness. And valuation is based on prices that typical buyers would be warranted in paying for homes for long-time use or long-term investments.

In concluding, I appeal to the Congress for action on these vitally important questions of today. We should not adjourn until we have faced up to our responsibilities.

The times are perilous and the days for decision are limited.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain excerpts and extraneous matter.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WANTED: HOMES FOR THE HOMELESS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, not on Shangri-La or Mars but here in the United States and particularly for the 1,307 people of Chelsea, Mass., who are being kicked out of their lodgings to make way for a bridge.

Homes for the dispossessed, not in 1848, or 1958, but now.

Unless we put roofs over the heads of these men, women, and children, the Nation will be forced to the lamentable conclusion that the organized minority which puts property rights above human rights has seized power again.

A mass eviction of 1,307 people in a city of 42,000, people who are working not only to make a living for themselves but to provide assistance to the people of many other nations. Is it not incongruous that our people are asked to do so much with so little regard for their elementary needs?

I am amazed and angered that the desperate problem of housing in the United States is considered with such indifference by the majority party in Congress whose sworn duty it is to work for the common welfare. It is with serious misgivings that I view their claims that they should be entrusted with the responsibility of governing our people.

This is not an academic problem which faces us. It will not be solved by statistics. The real-estate lobby, powerful as it is, cannot make the sun and rain and cold and snow stand by while it has its way. It cannot avert, even if it were so minded, the social frictions, the deterioration of morale, the danger to

health and life itself, which are inherent in the stubborn refusal to recognize that we are dealing with human beings and their imperative needs.

Our great and powerful democracy stands challenged on many fronts, but no one of these threats is more serious than the question of its will to do right by its own people.

It is not a question of means, but of purpose. By concentrating on the tree instead of the forest, special interests are even unwittingly undermining the confidence of the people in their Government. I say that those responsible have much to answer for, unless they face up squarely and sincerely to the realities of life in the United States in this year of 1948.

The crisis in housing cannot be postponed.

It is here.

It must be met.

I cite you the predicament of Chelsea, Mass. It is of an emergency nature which no one in his right mind could deny. Maybe it is a special case, but it is symptomatic of the dark and festering sore which is breeding much danger for our society. Perhaps there are some who will refuse to look at the facts and by not seeing them pretend that they do not exist.

The plight of Chelsea brings these bleak facts into sharp and anguished focus.

I wish that you could see pictures of the women with children in their arms who stormed the city hall at Chelsea, waving 113 eviction notices, which give them only until September 1 to move. These are but the vanguard of the 1,307 people who will be dispossessed.

Most of these women were sobbing, some in grief, some in anger. Some were expectant mothers, some have invalids in their families, but all were women, their protective instincts aroused by that which they feared and could not understand. These lives, this true wealth of our Nation, forced to get out to make way for a bridge, with no substitute accommodations available for them.

If you saw this sight I am certain that most of you would forget pride and prejudice and preferment and move swiftly to meet the challenge. Fixed and rigid attitudes would melt and the Members of this House, by whatever compromise or adjustment might be necessary, would provide adequate housing for our displaced fellow Americans.

This House cannot adjourn and close the door to mercy.

In Chelsea it all began with a bridge, authorized by the Legislature of Massachusetts, to cross the Mystic River, connecting Chelsea with Charlestown, Mass. The bridge is necessary to relieve a traffic bottleneck. It is a high-level bridge. Many, many homes must be razed to clear the long approaches to the bridge.

Sounds simple in terms of engineering.

As a preliminary, the bridge authority issued pieces of paper called eviction notices, and the victims were left to shift for themselves.

Of course, there is a chance that an injunction may stave off these evictions. But an injunction is hardly calculated to provide homes.

This is where the Federal Government has the opportunity and the duty to step in and help before the winter comes.

White House, War Assets Administration, War Department, Navy Department, Federal Housing Administration, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and many other agencies—out of these many resources there must be some response to this urgent call for help for the evacuees of Chelsea, Mass., and through this Congress for the millions of Americans who are worried about the housing shortage, in the name of a Government which is representative of the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Southern Agriculturalist entitled "Life on the Farm," written by one of his constituents.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in six separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MY RECORD IN CONGRESS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, this is the last time that I shall have the opportunity to address this House, for I am a candidate for United States Senator from Louisiana, for the next regular term of office, in the Democratic primary to be held on August 31, 1948.

For the past 8 years I have represented the Third Louisiana District in Congress excepting the time I served in the United States Army as a private after having resigned my membership from Congress. My record will show, I believe, that I have been diligent, competent, energetic, and faithful in my duties. While naturally my work has been primarily concerned with matters pertaining to my congressional district, I have devoted much time and attention to subjects of interest and importance to the welfare of Louisiana as a whole. I am proud of our great State which offers such great promise of future development. To the residents of my district, and to those living in other congressional districts of Louisiana who may not know me nor my record, I wish to take this occasion to acquaint them with my work in Congress, which I hope may be the means of causing them to favor my candidacy for the United States Senate.

AGRICULTURE

The people of the Third Congressional District are to a large extent dependent upon agriculture for a livelihood. Our rich lands, fertilized by the accumulation of the soils of the Mississippi Valley, are most adaptable to the production of sugarcane, rice, cotton, sweetpotatoes, truck crops, and numerous other agricultural products. Realizing the importance of agriculture, I am constantly devoting attention to the best development of our farm resources, as well as the expansion and development of our livestock and dairy industries. I believe that my record in behalf of agriculture is well known and that I have the good will and confidence of the farmers of my district.

SUGAR

Those connected with the sugar industry, which means so much to the economic welfare of Louisiana, are familiar with my work in its behalf. They know of my leadership in the adoption of necessary legislation, particularly the recent Sugar Act passed by Congress. This act brought more stability and security to the sugar industry than at any time in its history and will be in effect until December 31, 1952. It allows Louisiana and Florida a production quota of 500,000 tons of sugar annually, providing the largest percentage quota increase of any of the domestic areas and permits Louisiana to grow practically all the sugarcane it is now capable of producing, at the same time continuing benefit payments. It was through my efforts that the fair wage and fair price determination provisions of the former sugar act were retained, in keeping with the wishes of the industry.

AID FOR SMALL FARMERS

I have been especially sympathetic to the cause of the small sugar farmers. Through my efforts it was possible to have all sugarcane growers share for the first time in payments on blackstrap molasses and as a result they are enjoying an additional revenue of around 60 cents per ton for sugarcane, which they never received before.

During the labor shortage World War II occasioned I was instrumental in obtaining the service of thousands of prisoners of war for farm work in Louisiana. Without this labor it would have been impossible to harvest our cane crop. During the war I gave much attention to the shortage of farm equipment confronting the farmer and was able to secure for them necessary machinery, trucks, tires, and other items they required for the cultivation and harvesting of the cane crop.

More recently I assisted in obtaining fertilizer for the 1948 cane crop. A serious shortage developed, but through contacts with the Department of Agriculture officials and manufacturers, we were able to relieve the situation.

The sugar industry throughout the years has been unsettled because of its position in international trade; it has frequently been used as a political football. Sugar legislation is the most complicated of all agricultural legislation in Washington. It is only through constant study and experience that one becomes competent in the handling of the various complex problems. I am glad of the knowledge that I have gained in this connection which enables me to be of the greatest possible service.

RICE

Louisiana produces over one-third of the rice that is grown in the United States. Vermilion Parish, in my district,

is the largest rice-producing parish in the country, and rice is also produced in every other parish in the Third Congressional District. The rice farmers and the industry in general have enjoyed prosperity during the last few years. Many of our citizens are engaged in the farming, milling, and marketing of rice. They are aware that I have been active and successful in looking after their interests.

The rice industry has been confronted with many problems during and since World War II, and I have given much attention to these matters. My efforts have been directed toward seeing that adequate markets are made available and fair prices maintained. I have fought the efforts of the Government to assist the production of rice in other countries in competition to our own industry. I opposed the unreasonable Government set-aside policy of allocating American rice to other nations on a basis which greatly limited our domestic supply. This was a blow to the movement to increase the per capita consumption of rice in this country. I have repeatedly pointed out that the per capita consumption must be raised and new uses found for rice if we are to avoid surplus rice production in normal periods.

Last year when the rough-rice market was paralyzed, due to harvesting difficulties and lack of adequate storage space, and the situation was steadily growing worse, I flew to Washington from Louisiana, as Congress was then in recess. After conferences with officials of the Department of Agriculture, a program was worked out by which the Government agreed to purchase a large quantity of rice for foreign relief. This action accelerated the market for rough rice, the mills began to buy, and the Louisiana rice growers were saved from a ruinous loss. Only recently, together with other Members of Congress from rice areas, I headed the movement to prevent the Government from arbitrarily reducing the price to be paid for export rice to foreign countries. If this had occurred it would have resulted in a break in the rice market, and our farmers, as well as millers, would have suffered a great loss this season.

COTTON

The cotton growers will have the benefit of support prices for 1948 of 92½ percent of parity price. Since the indications are of a large crop of cotton this year, this support price may prove valuable in preventing a break in the prices. I worked to help bring about this support price.

SWEETPOTATOES AND SIRUP SURPLUS

The sweetpotato industry in south Louisiana has made great strides. The sirup industry has been in existence since sugarcane was first produced in this country. The war brought about a dislocation in these two industries, placing them in danger of having to curtail operations or stop them altogether. I assisted, with other interested Congressmen, in helping to remove the surplus on sweetpotatoes. We are now assisting the sirup producers to sell the large surplus they have on hand to the Economic Cooperation Administration. I am confident we will be successful.

FARM LEGISLATION

I have advocated and worked for:

First. Support price for cotton.

Second. Parity income for farmers.

Third. Scientific research to discover new uses for farm products.

Fourth. Low interest rate on farm loans.

Fifth. Better farm-tenant program.

Sixth. More stability for family sized farms.

Seventh. Soil-conservation program.

Eighth. Long-range agriculture program.

Ninth. Inclusion of farm wages in determining price of agricultural commodities.

And all other legislation beneficial to the interest of the farmer.

COMMENDED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Some time ago a constituent of mine wrote the Secretary of Agriculture about my activities in Congress on agricultural matters and I am very glad to produce the Secretary's letter in reply:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 1, 1948.

Mr. RAY BREAUX,
Lafayette Parish Farm Bureau,
Carencro, La.

MY DEAR MR. BREAUX: I received your inquiry in behalf of farmers of your section, relative to the activities of Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX in agricultural matters.

I have had occasion to observe Congressman DOMENGEAUX'S work on many occasions and I can say with the utmost sincerity that he is most energetic, progressive, and effective in representing the farming interests of the Nation and particularly those of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX was very active and forceful in adoption of the present Sugar Act. He is especially helpful to the small farmers. Through his efforts these farmers were able for the first time to share in payments on blackstrap molasses and now enjoy an additional revenue of around 60 cents a ton on sugarcane.

We have felt that in rice matters Congressman DOMENGEAUX has constantly protected the best interests of the farmers, millers, and distributors. When the rice industry faced a crisis last year, due to a paralyzed market for rough rice in the face of an approaching new crop, Congressman DOMENGEAUX, then in Louisiana during the recess of Congress, flew to Washington and conferred with Department of Agriculture officials. Out of these conferences grew a program by which the Department was able to arrange for the purchase of rice for relief purposes abroad.

The sweetpotato people also have a real friend in Congressman DOMENGEAUX, who has likewise faithfully looked after the interests of the cotton industry, the truck farmers, and others engaged in agricultural endeavors.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX has frequently conferred with me and it has been a pleasure to cooperate with him.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

When I first came to Congress 8 years ago, REA was an infant. Notwithstanding the shortage of materials resulting from the war, this program has developed to the extent that thousands of farms in my congressional district and numerous thousands elsewhere are now serviced with electricity. I hope to see the day when every farm in Louisiana and throughout the Nation will be able to obtain electric service. Farm life must be made easier so as to encourage more people to stay on the farms. Just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so, those living on farms everywhere in the United States should be able to enjoy the same electrical conveniences as those in the towns and cities. I have always supported adequate appropriations to maintain and develop this service and will continue to do so.

SEA-FOOD INDUSTRY

Louisiana is widely famed for its delicious sea foods. Much of the commercial fishing centers in my congressional district, which borders on the Gulf of Mexico, and its numerous bays, lakes, and bayous. Thousands of our people make a livelihood from the production and marketing of shrimp, oysters, and other sea food. This brings to them and to our State many millions of dollars annually.

Throughout my service in Congress I have constantly devoted time to looking after the welfare and development of the steadily growing sea-food industry. I have done this because I realize the Gulf of Mexico offers to our people an inexhaustible means of wealth. No one knows how great the possibilities are. I am confident, however, that the income of our citizens can be increased many millions of dollars a year through scientific and intelligent approach to the various problems confronting the fishing industry. We must determine with accuracy just what these resources are and how best to utilize them. I have recently proposed legislation that I have every reason to believe can be passed at the next session of Congress, which will provide an appropriation of $500,000 for the purpose of providing the necessary research work in behalf of the fishing industry of the Gulf coast. Due to wartime activities and shortage of personnel it has been difficult to collect fishery statistics in that area.

The oyster industry can be greatly expanded. At the present time we do not use more than 10 percent of potential tidal bottoms which could be utilized for oyster production. The Louisiana oyster industry has expanded in the past few years, but mass mortality of oysters has seriously threatened the continued existence of that industry.

CRABS

Louisiana could produce more crab meat than any other State, yet it falls much below Maryland and Virginia in this respect. We could increase our crab production tremendously. No study of a biological nature has been made of the menhaden; still there was a greater poundage of menhaden produced in the United States in 1946 and 1947 than any other species of fish. Only a small percentage of this came from the Gulf, although it is well known that menhaden are abundant in these waters.

This may be a critical period in the shrimp fishery. The shrimp catch has

remained about the same, notwithstanding the fact there have been many new boats added for shrimp fishing. We have not learned sufficient about the biology of the shrimp, and it is estimated that an annual production valued at $100,000,000 is in prospect if properly developed.

Very little is known of the life history of such valuable sport and commercial fishes as speckled trout, redfish, croakers, sheephead, mullet, and tarpon. The passage of this bill that I have introduced, together with an appropriation, will make it possible to increase our sea-food production many millions of dollars. I pledge myself to work untiringly to secure the passage of this legislation.

MEXICO SHRIMP IMPORTATIONS

Louisiana shrimp interests are being menaced by the increasing importation of Mexican shrimp. Mexico enjoys an advantage because of cheap labor. To protect the many producers and packers in Louisiana and other Gulf States, I have introduced legislation providing that the total importation from Mexico of fresh, iced, canned, and processed shrimp into the United States in any one calendar year shall not exceed the largest total quantity of such importations during any calendar year between January 1, 1942, and December 31, 1945. Imports restricted to this period would be relatively small.

OYSTER REHABILITATION

The Louisiana oyster industry sustained heavy losses in the Mississippi River flood of 1945. I succeeded in having a bill enacted for an appropriation of $50,000 for a survey to be made by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine the extent of this damage and method of rehabilitating the beds. After this survey is completed I will endeavor to secure additional funds so as to reimburse those oyster producers who suffered this loss.

I am particularly gratified by the passage of this legislation because it establishes a precedent that the Government must be responsible for damages that may be sustained through the use of flood-control projects, such as the Atchafalaya-Morganza-Bonne Carre spillway.

The sea-food industry in Louisiana has enjoyed much prosperity during the last few years. I am glad that I have been able to contribute in many ways to the welfare and development of this great industry, and I pledge my continued efforts in this direction.

WATERWAY AND FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control and improvement of our waterways are most important to the safety and success of our people. Louisiana, particularly the Third Congressional District, until recent years has suffered from disastrous inundation, and flood control is a subject close to all of us. The Mississippi River and its tributaries drain approximately one-third of the United States, and much of these waters eventually descend on Louisiana. Much progress in protecting our area against floods has been made, but much remains to be done.

ATCHAFALAYA BASIN—MORGANZA SPILLWAY

Of foremost importance to flood control in our area is the need for completing work on the Atchafalaya spillway. Congress recently appropriated some $6,000,000 toward completing the project.

PROJECTS AIDED

I have constantly devoted my efforts in behalf of flood control, improvement of waterways, and establishment of new facilities. In this connection I might refer to the Bayou Carlin-Delcambre Canal; Bayou Lafourche; Bayou Boeuf; Bayous Little Caillou, Grand Caillou, Dularge, and Terrebonne; Bayou L'Eau Bleu; Teche-Vermilion program which recently received an additional appropriation of $600,000; Schooner Bayou, and other necessary projects.

I opposed, together with the people of the Morgan City-Berwick area, the inadequate floodgate proposed by the United States engineers in Bayou Boeuf. I will continue my efforts to have an adequate lock constructed instead.

Our people are seriously dependent upon our networks of bayous and other streams not only for adequate drainage but in their everyday pursuits. It is my plan and purpose to eventually secure an authorization and appropriation for the dredging of our many streams that flow into the Gulf, so as to afford our people the opportunity for full utilization of these waterways.

For quite some time I have been working with the people of the parishes of Assumption and Terrebonne to assist them in securing fresh waters in Bayou Lafourche at Napoleonville. The United States engineers are now studying this proposal and as soon as it is recommended I will continue my efforts toward securing the necessary funds to complete this project.

WATER HYACINTH AND ALLIGATOR GRASS ERADICATION

The problem of the water hyacinths and alligator grass which congest so many streams in Louisiana and other States is a matter of much concern. These water plants interfere with our drainage, obstruct navigation, menace health, and are killing our fish and wildlife. They cause many millions of dollars of damage to the State. I have realized this problem and in February of 1945 I secured an appropriation of $78,000 to make it possible for the United States engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the United States Public Health Service, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife of the Interior Department to conduct a comprehensive study and survey of the problem in order to find means of eradicating this menace once and for all. This scientific study and survey are now being made. Experimentation in the use of chemicals is under way, and I hope that within a short time an economical and practical method may be found, through these agencies, to do the job of extermination. I have a bill pending to appropriate $25,000,000 over a period of years for this purpose. The reports from the departments will be in shortly, and in the next Congress it is my plan to secure at least $5,000,000 to start the program of killing the water lily and alligator grass in all of our streams.

VETERANS

I am particularly happy to be of assistance to veterans and their dependents. I feel that the veterans, who made great sacrifices, are entitled to every consideration that the Federal Government is able to give them. I have always given close attention to their needs and have been able to help thousands of ex-servicemen who have written to me about their problems.

I had the privilege of serving as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which afforded me the opportunity of taking part in the preparation and enactment of much veteran legislation, including the GI bill of rights.

VETERAN BONUS

I advocate a veteran bonus; the payment of which is a direct responsibility of the Federal Government. My plan would pay the veteran $3 for every day spent while in the service in this country, and $5 for every day spent while in foreign service. In other words the veteran who served 3 years in any branch of the armed forces, two of which were overseas would receive $4,745.

WHAT VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS SAY

The best evidence of my service and achievements in behalf of the veterans and their dependents is contained in the following letters from national representatives of major veterans' organizations:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1948.

Mr. J. ELLIOTT CADE,
Past Vice Commander, the American Legion, Department of Louisiana, Abbeville, La.

DEAR MR. CADE: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 6, asking for the legislative record of Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, the Congressman from the Third Louisiana District.

As you know, he is a World War II veteran and a member of the American Legion.

In addition to the voting record, which I am attaching hereto, I might add that he has taken a very active interest in legislation affecting veterans, and in particular bills which we have requested him to introduce on our behalf. During the Eightieth Congress he introduced for us H. R. 1342, exempting from income tax individual income up to $5,000 earned in certain taxable years following discharge; and H. R. 3691, providing for the continuance of compensation of pension payments and subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I and World War II during education and training.

When he was a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee he visited a number of veterans' hospitals in connection with the inspection program authorized by that committee and as a result of which there was a complete reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration.

I trust this is the information which you desire.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1948.

Mr. SIDNEY DAIGLE,
Past Commander DAV,
Lafayette, La.

DEAR MR. DAIGLE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 1, requesting information as to the legislative record of the Honorable JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Representative of the Third Louisiana District. In reply please be advised that so far as veterans' legislation is concerned, we of the DAV have found Congressman DOMENGEAUX most helpful and cooperative.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX has always taken special interest in the welfare of veterans and has sponsored much legislation in their behalf. This included the increase granted in the rates of compensation, pension, and retirement pay of veterans of both World Wars and their dependents. He is author of a bill to extend to children of men who died in World War II the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights. He has sought tax relief for veterans of World War II, and the enactment of a measure which he introduced in Congress has made it possible for veterans to have priority in purchasing surplus boats, 65 feet in length or under, from the Government.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX was formerly a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in which connection he was particularly active. He took a prominent part in adoption of the GI bill of rights and as a one-man subcommittee inspected various veterans' hospitals. His recommendations for improved conditions undoubtedly influenced to a considerable extent the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration. His record as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was excellent from the viewpoint of veteran organizations. He is now a member of another committee, but has retained his great interest in veterans' legislation.

I hope this information will be of assistance to you in your chapter.

Yours very sincerely,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Director for National Legislation.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to advise that to the best of my knowledge and belief Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana, has a most favorable record in the Congress of the United States with respect to legislation affecting veterans and dependents of veterans. This office, as legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has always found Mr. DOMENGEAUX sympathetic and cooperative to our legislative program.

No effort has been made by this office to appraise Mr. DOMENGEAUX's record on legislation other than that which affects veterans and their dependents because it is not within the province or jurisdiction of this office to judge a Member of Congress except on his record dealing with veteran affairs. Mr. DOMENGEAUX was at one time a member of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation which handled the bulk of veteran legislation in the House of Representatives and his record as a member of that committee was excellent from the viewpoint of veteran organizations.

Very truly yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

AMVETS,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. DOMENGEAUX: In behalf of the American Veterans of World War II, better known as the AMVETS, I wish to take this means of expressing the appreciation of our organization for your efforts in Congress in behalf of the veterans and their dependents. We have observed your outstanding record in veterans' legislation matters and we are also familiar with the assistance you have given so many veterans with their individual problems. As you are yourself a veteran you are in an excellent position to best understand our views and our needs.

We are particularly grateful for your work in sponsoring legislation increasing the rates of compensation, pension, and retirement pay for veterans of both world wars and their dependents. You are also to be commended for the introduction of a bill to provide income tax relief for veterans of World War II.

You recognized a duty the Nation owes to the memory of the men who died in World War II, by introducing legislation to extend to their children the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights.

You made it possible, through another measure in Congress, for veterans of World War II to have priority in the purchase of surplus boats of 65 feet in length or under, and you took a very active part in the enactment of legislation enabling veterans to convert their terminal leave bonds into cash.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs you had a prominent part in the preparation and adoption of the GI bill of rights. Also as a member of the committee your energetic and thorough inspection of veterans' hospitals and your recommendations in this connection were followed by the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration, a step which had long been necessary.

We are very glad to take this opportunity to express our thanks.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
National Legislative Director.

I took an active part in the enactment of legislation to provide housing facilities for veterans. I was also active in the movement to provide terminal leave payments and to convert these bonds into cash. Through my efforts several additional offices of the Veterans' Administration were established in Louisiana to better meet local requirements.

MUSKRAT INDUSTRY

Large numbers of our citizens depend upon the fur industry for their livelihood. Muskrat fur trapping is a very important one in the Third Louisiana District. I have looked after the interests of the trappers at all times, particularly in the matter of a just return for their labor and securing for them fair prices for their skins. During OPA days I made a determined fight for lifting the ceiling price on muskrat fur, as the ceiling that had been established was creating a black market and working hardships on those engaged in trapping.

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

I consider that it is necessary for the Federal Government to assist our schools. I recognize that our teachers throughout the Nation are underpaid for the great work and responsibility that they shoulder. The problem involved in providing proper educational facilities and adequate salaries for teachers has become too extensive for the States to bear alone. There is no good reason why the Federal Government should not help in this matter. It is a national problem like health or safety or highways. It is a matter of national interest and national responsibility. Of course, we must guard against Federal control of schools. Bills that Congress considered during this session provide this safeguard. I regret that Congress did not enact these bills into law. I pledge and promise myself to see that this legislation is reintroduced in the next Congress and will work untiringly for its successful enactment.

FREE SCHOOL LUNCHES

Without the aid of the Federal Government, Louisiana and other States, would not be able to give free school lunches to our school children. The Federal Government has contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly to the State of Louisiana for this purpose and you may be assured that I will continue my efforts in seeing that these appropriations are continued so that school children of our State may be assured of appetizing and nutritious school lunches.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

It is the duty of the Federal Government to look after the welfare of our old people who need help. Surely they should not be forced to face privation and disaster after they have worked hard all of their lives. The Government can and should give them the assurance of security in their last years.

The Federal Government now contributes up to $25 per month payment for the old folks and the blind and up to $13.50 per month for dependent children. I am glad to state that only a few days ago Congress adopted legislation which will increase Federal payments to the old folks and the blind $5 a month and to dependent children $3 a month.

Our State has long struggled with the problem to furnish aid to the aged, the blind, and dependent children. Without Federal cooperation State aid would amount to comparatively little. If increases are to be granted, as have been planned in Louisiana, and elsewhere, it is necessary that the Federal Government offer additional benefits. The action of Congress makes this possible.

AUTHOR OF OLD-AGE PENSION BILL

When I first came to Congress in 1940 I introduced an old-age pension bill which would have provided at least $30 per month. This represented a substantial sum at that time, but because of the high cost of living today this amount is not adequate. For that reason I have introduced another bill known as H. R. 6638 which would provide direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to citizens 60 years of age or over.

I am sure that you realize that in Louisiana today over half of the money that goes toward paying an old-age pension is paid by the Federal Government. I am glad to state that I have voted and advocated these payments and will continue my efforts toward assisting the old people of the State.

TIDELANDS

The protection of the rights of the States to submerged lands within their respective boundaries is of vast importance to Louisiana. The income from these lands, through oil leases and otherwise, go to the State and parishes and make many public improvements possible, as well as contributing greatly to the financial support of our schools. Re-

cently the United States Supreme Court held that these tidelands belonged to the United States instead of to the respective States. Louisiana stands to lose over one billion dollars by this decision.

LEADS FIGHT

Shortly after the United States Supreme Court decision I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives for the purpose of having the Congress declare these lands belong to the States. The House of Representatives recently passed a measure which included the provisions of the bill I introduced. Unfortunately the Senate failed to vote on this legislation. As this is so important to the State of Louisiana, and since we stand to lose over $1,000,000,000, which is ten hundred thousand million, I, in the new Congress next year, will do everything in my power to reenact this legislation with the hope that it will successfully pass the Congress.

TAX REDUCTION

Tax reduction is necessary for the health of the American economic system and as a precaution against depression periods.

I voted for the income-tax reduction bill in Congress this year because it was greatly needed for relief of the American taxpayer from an excessive tax burden. I will continue to vote for tax reduction at every opportunity, providing it does not impair our national security and stability.

American business should be granted every opportunity to exercise free enterprise and initiative, with the least possible Government interference. Small business should be especially protected. There has been entirely too much Government regulation of business, even in time of war. I have consistently opposed moves toward business regimentation by the Federal Government, and have opposed legislation that would endanger small business because of monopolistic policies.

I have frequently criticized bureaucratic government and warned against increasing Federal control. The Government is intended to be the servant of the people, not the people the servants of the Government. States' rights must be respected and the principle of local government recognized to the fullest extent. The Federal pay roll should be watched carefully and all possible reductions made, consistent with good public service.

THE SOUTH AND CIVIL RIGHTS

I have fought at every opportunity the so-called civil-rights program recently advocated by the President at the expense of the South. I will continue to do so, for this is a matter that strikes at those natural rights which we in the South enjoy as a heritage from our forefathers, who established the principles of States' rights and self-government.

Prominent in the civil-rights program is the proposal for Fair Employment Practices Committee. This would mean Federal control over private business; the right to say whom a businessman should employ, regardless of race or color. The FEPC would destroy initiative and free enterprise.

The civil-rights program is opposed to segregation of the white and Negro races. If this idea was put into effect it would be a body blow to the South and to her people who know best how to handle the Negro situation.

Those who argue for antilynching legislation and an anti-poll-tax law, the abolishment of segregation, or for the FEPC disregard the fact that the first three would be an illegal invasion of States' rights and the latter an encroachment upon the fundamental conception of free enterprise.

The whole South must join in this fight, for those things which the South hold sacred are in danger of being destroyed. You can depend upon me to make this fight to the bitter end.

MY SERVICES APPRECIATED

I am very much gratified over the numerous expressions of appreciation regarding the services I render. The following extracts are taken from some of the many letters, telegrams, and other communications addressed to me by my constituents and others from my district:

It is with pleasure I write to express my gratitude for your approval of the Federal aid to education bills. We of Terrebonne Parish hope that no complications will arise to prevent you from giving them your continued support.

MRS. ODESSA BABIN,
Schriever Route, Box 126.

Be it resolved, That the teachers of Terrebonne Parish commend Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX and express their appreciation to him for the interest that he has taken in the affairs of the teachers and children of the State and Nation. (From resolution adopted by Terrebonne Parish Teachers Association, Marguerite E. Watkins, chairman.)

GERMANY, *January 2, 1945.*

I really admired your action in resigning from Congress to join the Army as a private. I'm sorry you had to get out on a medical discharge, but I feel that a guy like you can do us more good in Washington than as a private anyway.

Lt. WILLIAM J. DODD
(Now Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana.)

Thank you and your office for the splendid cooperation in getting adequate housing here for veterans. With the completion of the apartments at the airport and the 118 which were recently constructed on the campus, I feel that the problem is well on the way toward being solved. We deeply appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

JOEL L. FLETCHER,
President of Southwestern Louisiana Institute.

My people join with me in expressing their appreciation and thanks for the fine cooperation given to the town of Thibodaux in getting planning money from the Federal Works Agency for our city projects. Accept personal thanks from me.

CHAS. E. DELAS, *Mayor.*

I received a copy of your remarks on increased pay for servicemen. I am proud to know that you are still fighting for us and for our people at home. I am one of the happiest soldiers in the service to know that I have not been forgotten by our Congressman.

Pvt. PAUL J. BREAUX.

It is with pleasure I write to thank and congratulate you for your good work and your support as a Member of Congress from Louisiana in increasing the pay for men in our armed forces. I felt proud to show all the boys in our company how you have done your part in passing the bill we have been waiting for so long. You will never be forgotten.

Pvt. CLAUDE JUDICE.

I wish to thank you for the help you gave me in obtaining for my son, Charles L. Broussard, his subsistence pay while attending the Acme Neon Institute in Chicago. Charles is very appreciative also of your kindness in this matter and sends his best regards.

Mrs. J. L. BROUSSARD,
New Iberia, La.

The Lafayette Parish World War II Veterans' Association extends its thanks and appreciation for the assistance and splendid cooperation which you have rendered in our campaign for veterans' housing and fair rent rates.

CHARLES PERILLOUX,
President.

Your efforts to secure an effective priority rating for the owners of power boats in the fishing industry is very much appreciated by the owners and operators of such boats.

C. E. KING,
THE MORGAN CITY REVIEW,
Morgan City, La.

The Jeanerette Chamber of Commerce wishes to express its thanks for your prompt efforts in helping us to maintain the dairy at the Iberia Live Stock Experiment Farm. It is our hope that the experimental farm will be allotted sufficient funds for continuation.

L. C. LAMPO, Jr.,
Secretary-Manager, Jeanerette Chamber of Commerce.

I want to thank you for your interest and good work in behalf of the United States postal employees' H. R. 5059. This increase in pay is much needed by all. We know we can always count on you for a helping hand.

JOSEPH E. BLANCHARD,
Postmaster, Raceland, La.

Thanks for everything, and if I can ever repay you in any way for the interest you are taking in me, all you have to do is tell me what I can do for you.

RUFUS W. FONTENOT,
New Orleans.

I wish to thank you for your telegram received today about my son, Wilson M. O'Niell, who is in England in a hospital. Your news was very welcome, and I assure you Anne and I both appreciate your efforts in the matter.

W. MCKERALL O'NIELL,
Franklin, La.

At our recent Louisiana parent-teacher convention in Lafayette, our organization reaffirmed its belief in the urgent need of Federal aid to education. We appreciate all your efforts in helping to secure this legislation.

Mrs. W. S. VINCENT,
President.

I really believe this editorial represents the opinion of a great majority of the people of this section. (Editorial referred to appeared in Lafayette Daily Advertiser of June 18, 1946,

commending Members of Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives for voting to override the Presidential veto of tax-reduction bill. It stated in part: "Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX was lined up with the Louisiana delegation and the Democrats who crossed the party line in the effort to save some money for the overburdened taxpayer. The Third District is to be congratulated that its Congressman had the welfare of the people at heart and that he was not concerned in the expediency of politics.")

A. P. ELLIOTT,
Lafayette, La.

You have read my wishes in your demands on President Truman regarding rice and sugar. I am as yet wondering why the unadulterated discrimination against southern farmers. Glory to you.

DR. A. A. COMEAUX,
Abbeville, La.

I wish to take this means to tell you that your vote on matters of importance have coincided with my views most of the time and have met with my hearty approval.

G. O. PHARR,
New Iberia, La.

I want to take this means of thanking you for all that you have done for me in settling a travel claim. Final payments have been received.

JOHN R. REAUX, *Veteran,*
Lafayette, La.

With reference to our phone conversation and the wires we exchanged, I wish to express my appreciation for the efforts you put forth and the manner in which you kept us posted on developments. Your bill on the oyster situation is causing much favorable comment from the oyster people around here, and it is another act for which you are being highly commended.

DONALD BOLLINGER,
Lockport, La.

I was very much interested and impressed by the speech you delivered in Congress and wish to tell you that this country needs your type of Representative in Congress who is not afraid to express his beliefs. Keep up the good work. We are with you.

GUST CATSULIS,
New Iberia, La.

Just to let you know I deeply appreciated your prompt attention and answer to my inquiry. Mrs. Duhon and I both thank you for your kind and courteous service.

J. O. DUHON, M. D.,
Lafayette, La.

At a recent meeting of our organization we discussed with elation the manner in which you supported the passage of our retirement bill. We unanimously resolved to take the pleasure and the privilege of thanking you for your interest in our legislation.

ABRAHAM KOKOCINSKI,
President,
CLARENCE O. LEBLANC,
Secretary,
Branch 1760, National Association of Letter Carriers.

The board of directors of the Lafayette Chamber of Commerce unanimously endorse your splendid effort to have flood-control appropriations restored by President. Activation and completion of these important works are economically justified and should provide beneficial returns to State and Nation. We commend your action and offer our continued help to further this cause.

LAFAYETTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LEE G. LAFOSSE,
Secretary-Manager.

We want to thank you for the special effort and attention you have shown in behalf of the sirup manufacturers of Louisiana. We will be glad to furnish any information you may need.

C. S. STEEN SYRUP MILL, INC.,
J. WESLEY STEEN,
Abbeville.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the work you have been doing in behalf of the Louisiana sirup manufacturers. The situation is very serious with quite a number of us, and unless we get some relief through the Government purchasing a large quantity of the 1947 crop it is going to be tough sledding. Please keep up the good work; I am sure you will do all that you can to help out.

HALL GRAIN & SYRUP CO.,
H. T. HALL,
Manager, New Iberia.

I want to let you know that the people around here are for you. They appreciate the things you have done for us in Congress.

LYDIA COMEAUX,
Milton, La.

I want to thank you on behalf of the Vermilion Parish Teachers' Association for your support.

NOAH LANGLINAIS,
President, Indian Bayou, La.

I want to commend you on the stand you took relative to increasing the pay of men in the armed forces. I have two sons in the country's service. Needless to say I am proud of them, but I too think the boys who have had to give up their home life deserve an increase in pay. So again I congratulate you on your noble stand.

Mrs. LLOYD B. MILLER,
Abbeville, La.

This is to express the sincere appreciation of the large segment of the rice industry which we represent, for your untiring efforts and the splendid contribution which you made in having the administrative agencies of the Government provide an export allocation for rice, principally for shipment to Cuba. This allocation, although long and unnecessarily delayed, will permit millers and exporters to dispose of the surplus from the 1947 crop, and enable producers to prepare for the 1948 crop with some assurance of being able to obtain a fair price.

THE RICE MILLER'S ASSOCIATION,
W. M. REID,
Executive Vice President.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the favor rendered my son, Edward, and myself. It is nice to have friends that you can depend on when you are in trouble and that is exactly what you have done for us. Edward was in the Marines and wounded three times, and is still a little nervous. Not receiving his pay did not help matters at all. Through your kind efforts the check has been received.

LARRY LOGAN, *Lafayette, La.*

I was fortunate enough to read a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you put up a fight for the soldiers' increase in pay. May I congratulate you for the work and effort put forth on that bill. I hope every father and soldier in the Third District realize the good work you have done.

J. J. PRINCE,
Lafayette, La.

Thanks for your vote and support of farm bloc bill regarding new formula for parity price. Keep up the fight we know you can put up and will. We appreciate your work.

LAFAYETTE PARISH FARM BUREAU,
S. A. CALLAHAN,
President, Lafayette, La.

Your brilliant work played an important part in winning the game. Congratulations. We are solid behind you.

A. O. RAPPELET,
Houma, La.

I want to thank you for your efforts in the matter of automobile deal discounts before the House Small Business Committee. Your interest and efforts in this matter are very much appreciated and I hope you will continue them toward a just settlement.

JOS. A. DAIGRE,
President, New Iberial Austo Co., New Iberia.

I want to sincerely thank you for your wholehearted efforts which resulted in the announcement of decontrol of all types of shrimp. In behalf of the industry and your many friends here, and for myself, please accept sincere thanks.

JULIAN MCPHILLIPS,
Chairman, Shrimp Industry Advisory Committee.

Moved by Mr. Howard Olivier, seconded by Mr. Roy LaBauve, that the police jury of Iberia Parish extends its expression of gratitude to United States Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX for his good work in trying to have Government controls removed from sugar and rice. Motion carried. (From minutes of meeting of police jury of Iberia Parish, November 14, and submitted by Marcul Deblanc, secretary and treasurer.)

It is with gratitude that I express my sincere appreciation for your continued and successful effort concerning the dredging of the mouth of Bayou Lafourche. I cannot overemphasize the value of this project and what it means to our industry and I take pleasure in assuring you that I and the community will be ever grateful.

E. MILTON EGLE,
Golden Meadow, La.

OFFICE POLICY

Since I have been in Congress I have followed certain policies which have enabled me to render careful and able service to my constituents:

First. Answer mail promptly.

Second. I never ask "For whom did you vote in the last election?" I ask, "What can I do to help you?"

Third. Always remember that each day is a day closer to the next election when an accounting must be made.

Fourth. There is no unimportant problem to the constituent who seeks the aid of his Congressman, and if it is important to my constituent it is important to me.

Fifth. There are no factions or political lines after the vote is counted. A good Congressman is everybody's Congressman.

Sixth. It does not matter who you are, what you are or where you came from. If you think enough of me to ask my help, I think enough of you to do all I can to help.

Seventh. I cannot do everything, but I do everything I can.

Eighth. A direct question justifies a direct answer. It must either be "Yes" or "No."

Ninth. You may not agree with me but you will always know where I stand.

Tenth. I am hired by the people of the Third District to represent them. It is a 24-hour job. I have no other business or interest, except that of being a good Congressman—and being a good Congressman takes undivided attention and time. I will carry on these same policies should I be elected to the Senate.

THANK YOU

Louisiana has been good to me—I was born a poor boy and worked my way through school. I have had some little measure of success. My people who are of French and Irish blood have lived in Lafayette Parish for over 200 years; they joined with the Anglo-Saxons of north Louisiana to fight for the South—a close blood relative, Gen. Alfred Mouton, gave his life to the cause at the battle of Mansfield.

I present this record as proof of my ability to fill a higher public office. I greatly appreciate the honor the people of the Third Louisiana Congressional District conferred upon me when they elected me to represent them in Congress, and the approval of my work as expressed by my overwhelming re-election for the past three terms to office. I hope that I have the opportunity of rendering still more service to the State and Nation as a Member of the United States Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EVINS, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. COOPER, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. PRIEST, for remainder of week, on account of important business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2482. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451, U. S. C., 718b), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 4, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1705. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of pig iron for certain industries requiring cast iron for the manufacture of products for residential housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1706. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the tenth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1707. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the progress report for the second quarter of 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1708. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the sixteenth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period April 1 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1709. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report including the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claims against the Central Intelligence Agency during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1710. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certified copies of acts of the Sixth Special Session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, May 14 to 21, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1711. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 totaling $11,305,800 (H. Doc. No. 736); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1712. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Navy Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7088. A bill to extend the benefits of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to certain employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia not covered by that act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7089. A bill for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a post office at Winchester, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 7090. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Iuka, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7091. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Claire M. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of 29 Latvians who entered the United States on July 22, 1948, at Provincetown, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 7095. A bill to record the lawful admission of Ibrahim Wadie Harb to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 7096. A bill for the relief of George N. Weaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7097. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2139. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Genevieve Hartig Toth and others, of Osceola, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to building a lasting peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

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

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the inspiration of all that is beautiful, we thank Thee for the joys which cheer us and for the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

Help us to discipline ourselves to obey Thy will more perfectly, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace. Make us victorious over those despondent and cynical tempers of mind which at times eclipse our faith.

May we accept the Master's overtures of counsel and companionship in order that we may carry on courageously. Grant that His principles of righteousness and justice may be the foundation on which we are seeking to build a more glorious nation and a better world.

In His name we bring our petitions. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 2, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AS TO NIGHT SESSION, ETC.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two announcements for the benefit of Members of the Senate. In view of the fact that we are still on the motion to take up House bill 29, on which motion a cloture petition to limit debate was filed, and since several speeches are to be made, including at least one on this side of the aisle, to be delivered by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], running to the constitutionality of the bill—and I know of two or three Senators on the other side of the aisle who would like to speak on that point—we will endeavor to keep the Senate in session, if it meets with the approval of the Members of the Senate, until 10 o'clock tonight. Announcement about night sessions after that will be made tomorrow. So I trust all Senators will take notice and will be on the floor listening to the constitutional arguments, which I think should