MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 25, 1949:
S. 492. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issue of a charter to the Waterways, Dredging, and Hulling of the city of Alexandria, Va."
S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia.

On February 26, 1949:
S. 547. An act to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 54. An act to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and
H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate until Thursday of this week, as they are engaged on official committee business: The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FEWELL], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Gurney], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from the session of the Senate on Friday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE OATH

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Allen
Anderson
Baldwin
Brewster
Broder
Broughton
Butler
Calm
Chaves
Connally
Corbin
Currie
Dayton
Dewey
Eastland
Eton
Ebling
Flanders
Fulbright
George
Gillette
Hendrickson
Hill
Hoy
Holland
Humphrey
Hunt

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent on public business; the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]; and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FEWELL]; and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAFEHART] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Gurney], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Gardner], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]; and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Mr. LUCAS and other Senators addressed the Chair.
Mr. WHERRY. So the amount requested for this year is practically the same, is it not, as the amount requested for last year, and whatever was saved last year was not saved this year. Is it the $135,000 asked for in Senate Resolution 40?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have made an objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the question?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Nevada in the request he has made. I think it is exceedingly important that the request be granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of the present consideration of Senate Resolution 40?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Nevada in the request he has made. I think it is exceedingly important that the request be granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of the present consideration of Senate Resolution 40?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the question.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the question?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Nevada in the request he has made. I think it is exceedingly important that the request be granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of the present consideration of Senate Resolution 40?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the question.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the question?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Nevada in the request he has made. I think it is exceedingly important that the request be granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of the present consideration of Senate Resolution 40?
tration thereof, which had been submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on January 27, 1949, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; reported by that committee without amendment, thereupon referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and reported from that committee by Mr. HAYDEN on February 25, 1949, and forwarded to the Senate in the Senate journal on page 1, line 6, after the word "continued," to strike out "during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress" and to insert "until March 1, 1956," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 137, of the Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947 (providing for a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system), is hereby continued until March 1, 1950, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois (Mr. Lucas) has the floor. The Chair suggests to him that, in order to facilitate action upon ordinary routine matters, he ask unanimous consent that he may yield to Senators for routine matters and for insertions in the Record.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make such a request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection to such procedure. That would be the proper way to handle requests for insertion of matters into the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as usual.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:
A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Education of the Executive Departments:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a department of natural resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that department and of other important Federal departments and agencies in Denver; and

"2. The location of a regional office of that department and of other important Federal departments and agencies in Denver; and

"3. The location of the United States military academy of the air likewise in Denver; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to any duly constituted and convened Senate or House of Representatives representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to make Indians citizens of the United States in order that they may be able to vote

"Whereas there are approximately 400,000 Indians in the United States for whom the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, exercises a trusteeship, in accordance with treaties made between the United States and the Indians and with the statutes enacted by the Congress; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs provides educational facilities for Indian children or they are otherwise educated in public schools; provides medical care and health programs; applies legal services for the needy, the sick, and the disabled; provides agricultural and industrial guidance for the economic advancement of approximately 56,600,000 acres of Indian land; administers tribal and individual Indian moneys held in the United States, and furnishes credit to individuals and groups for educational, industrial, and agricultural projects; general works for the economic, educational, social, and civic advancement of the Indians to the end that they may become independent of special Federal aid or regulation; and

"Whereas notwithstanding all of these services to the Indians, they are not citizens of the United States; and whereas the result they are denied the privilege of voting in general elections—national, State, and local—including elections in the State of Colorado, unless and until they are emancipated and given the right of citizenship by special acts of the Congress; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, and the widespread opinion of citizens throughout the country, that Indians should be citizens of the United States without further delay to right a grave and long-standing injustice; and whereas the Congress has determined that an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: Now, therefore, be it

\[Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Federal Security Administrator, to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and to North Dakota's delegation in Congress.\]

By Mr. MCCRATH (for himself and Mr. Grasse):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Senate of the United States:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"That the resolution providing for annual proclaiming by the President of the United States of America of October 11 as General
Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski who died on the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the death of this great hero in the Revolutionary War, and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Pulaski's Memorial Day believing it fitting through legislative enactment have designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, in pursuance of the Acts and Resolution of Providence Plantations hereby memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; and be it further resolved, that duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the respective Houses of Congress and to the Senate and Congressmen from Iowa.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing the Congress to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Whereas world developments since 1941 have made it increasingly apparent that the securing of a permanent and just peace will inevitably be attended with vastly increased complications with foreign nations, particularly with the European and Asiatic nations, and the great industries located on the Great Lakes and the agriculture of the Northwest States will benefit as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence as a shorter route for ocean commerce to deliver to foreign nations the products of our Industries and agriculture, and more than ever before the development of the power to be generated by the St. Lawrence is recognized as an vital economic necessity; and Whereas the agreement is now again being submitted to the Congress of the United States for approval, the Presidents of the United States for the past 29 years have committed themselves to the development of the St. Lawrence, and President Harry S. Truman has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal and a vital necessity as a defense measure; and Whereas the state of Minnesota, through its legislature, for the last 20 years has affirmed its continued support of this project, and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission, the United States has continuously promoted the development of the St. Lawrence River, believing that the process of such development will stimulate and develop the resources of the State and of the entire Northwest, as well as a great economic advantage to the entire Nation, and that the project has already been too long delayed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house of representa­
tives, the senate concurred and shall support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent, and energetic sup­port of this project, and the Congress of the United States, without further delay, to approve and ratify the agreement already consummated and the necessary steps to be taken to provide the necessary funds for the speedy completion of this great project as a vital, economic, and defense necessity, be it further resolved, that the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Sensa­tors and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing the Congress to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Whereas world developments since 1941 have made it increasingly apparent that the

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing the Congress to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Whereas world developments since 1941 have made it increasingly apparent that the
Memorial Day.

President of the United States Government now owns 2,500 acres of land known as Sedalia Air Field, located 10 miles east of Warrensburg and 19 miles west of Sedalia, Mo.; and

Whereas this site is already adequately equipped with a water supply, sewage disposal, surface drainage and storm sewers, four concrete runways 7,200 feet long and 150 feet wide with 2,400,000 square feet of parkway aprons, railroad switch tracks from the main line of the Missouri Pacific Railroad, Federal Highway No. 50 and other connecting highways, 13 miles of black-top streets, electric power facilities, and a pipe line system connecting a supply of natural gas; and

Whereas this location has the strategic advantage in time of war of being situated along the east and west coasts and our north and south borders; and

Whereas this location is within 60 miles of Jefferson City, the capital of the metropolitan area easily accessible; and

Whereas the recreation facilities of the famous Ozark region are easily accessible; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., does recommend to the Members of the United States Congress that careful and complete consideration be given to the facilities offered by the Sedalia Air Field as a suitable site for the proposed United States Air Academy; and be it further

Resolved, That members of Missouri's congressional delegation be furnished with a copy of this resolution and asked to exert their best efforts toward securing congressional action for the selection of the Sedalia Air Field as the location for the United States Air Academy, as recommended by the City Council of Kansas City, Mo.

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1933, October 11, 1942, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Wilkes-Barre and the State of Pennsylvania in session assembled:

1. That hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of each of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania.

Attest,

LOCIUS K. BREGNIE, City Clerk.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY CORN BELT LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 24, 1949, AT KANSAS CITY, MO.

1. We urge hotels and restaurants to reduce the prices of their meat course dinners in conformity with the break since last summer in wholesale meat prices, and to endeavor to expand meat consumption in their places of business to former levels in which they took about 25 per cent of the total meat production.

2. We recommend to Army buyers that they buy, bone, and deep freeze a huge quantity of meat prior to the coming summer season to be sold at Kansas City, Mo., for the benefit of the Army during the summer when supplies will be much more short. We also call attention of owners of lockers and deep freeze units that conditions point to much smaller supplies of meat later on and recommend that they accumulate supplies during this time of heaviest marketing.

3. We demand that America be protected from imports of goods or products manufactured or produced by peasant or slave labor. We demand that the American farmer be given the same protection against the competitive oils and fats produced by cheap foreign labor as industry is granted through the tariff or labor through the immigration laws.

4. We call upon the Congress to enact and maintain a labor law that will prevent the closing of the packing houses and other businesses affecting public health and safety, through strikes. While we grant the right of any laborer either to work or not to work at a given place or at a given wage or under given condition we dispute most violently the right of any group to force the closing of industries such as the packing establishments on which the farmers depend for their markets for livestock, and from which the public expects to receive the most vital product in its diet, and that is
Resolved, That the league urge Congress to repeal the Federal admissions tax so as to leave that field of excise taxation to the appropriate jurisdiction; and request the 1940 legislature to memorialize Congress to the same effect.

PROTEST AGAINST RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN HUNGARY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by local union No. 261, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plush Goods Workers of America, and calling on the Secretary of State to enter a diplomatic protest to Hungary because of religious persecution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas this executive board being composed of lay people, urges Congress to go on record, protesting the recent trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, prince of the church and priest of all Catholics of Hungary; and

Whereas the results of this so-called kangaroo trial was known to the prosecutors and witnesses before the trial even began, it was decided to carry on; and

Whereas another foreign government is also persecuting ministers of the Protestant faith; and

Whereas these governments being inside the iron curtain, controlled by orders of the Communist Party; and

Whereas the ideologies of the Soviet Government toward God and religion are known to the Christian world; and

Whereas these arrest and trials have been held in foreign countries where our great, free, independent Government has representation; therefore be it

Resolved, That this country through its State Department head enter a diplomatic protest to Hungary and all foreign powers who are persecuting religion on false pretense; therefore be it further

Resolved, That a protest also be made to the Security Council of the United Nations.

GENERAL PULASKI’S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF HOLYOKE, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the colleague and senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of Holyoke, Mass., memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve the General Pulaski’s Memorial Day resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski’s Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress.

Whereas a resolution providing for the celebration of General Pulaski’s Memorial Day in the State of Massachusetts is not approved; and

Resolved October 11 of each year as General Pulaski’s Memorial Day for the observance of the Legislature of the State of America in the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1777 is the date in American history of the heroic
death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received in battle on October 9, 1776, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, W. Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through their respective legislatures, have designated October 11 of each year as "General Pulaski’s Memorial Day"; and

Whereas it behooves us to commemorate the 206th anniversary of the death of this great America hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has, by legislative enactment, designated from October 11, 1779, to October 11, 1949, to be General Pulaski’s Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Holyoke and State of Massachusetts: Section 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to sign, a resolution to commemorate General Pulaski’s Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

Section 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

A true copy of this resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Aldermen of Holyoke, Mass., held February 15, 1949.

Attest: JOSEPH JUBENVILLE, Jr.,
City Clerk.

JOSEPH CARDINAL MINDZENZY—RESOLUTION OF SEVILLE COUNCIL, NO. 93, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, BROCKTON, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution by the Seville Council, No. 93, Knights of Columbus, Brockton, Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the unjust imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas at a meeting of Seville Council, No. 93, Knights of Columbus, Brockton, Mass., on Sunday, January 9, 1949, it was unanimously voted by the membership of 1,200 members; and

Whereas the Communist-controlled Government of Hungary did arrest and imprison unjustly his Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty; and

Whereas the entire Christian world looks upon this action by said Communist-controlled Hungary Government as a sacrilegious act; it is therefore resolved,

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to investigate the unjust imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and to seek his immediate release; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Ambassador of Hungary to this country at Washington, D. C.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from P. H. Pinkley, president of the Milwaukee Electric Railway & Transportation Company, two important resolutions. They were adopted by the executive committee of the board of directors of the American Transit Association, and the Association represents practically all of the important local, urban, transit operators in the United States, and the resolutions pertain to the Taft-Hartley law.

I endorse the sentiments in these resolutions and I ask that they be printed at this point in the Congressional Record and referred thereafter to the Senate Labor Committee for its careful attention.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Transit Association includes its membership more than 800 urban transit companies, which employ nearly 500,000 workers and 525 million passengers, with a total population of approximately 50,000,000. The vast majority of the employees of these companies are organized into local unions affiliated with A. F. of L. and CIO.

Local transit service is essential to the personal and economic well-being of the people of the communities served, so that the public welfare requires every reasonable effort to prevent labor controversies or any other cause.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service can do much in assisting to alleviate or adjust labor controversies in the transit industry, but only as long as it remains above suspicion of partiality and prejudice.

No matter how high may be the caliber and ideals of the men administering the Department of Labor, yet in the last analysis that Department is labor’s spokesman in the Government, constituted for and dedicated to advancing the cause of labor. It is not expected by labor to be without partisanship, and it can fairly question the motives inducing the Department of Labor, in its position, the association and effectuate its policies for which it is designed.

To provide a Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service now an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government—under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor, in its position, the association and effectuate its policies for which it is designed.

To provide for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—now an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government—under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor, in its position, the association and effectuate its policies for which it is designed.

Therefore, the American Transit Association respectfully urges that, in the public interest, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service be continued as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government and that, accordingly, the proposal to transfer the Service to the Department of Labor be rejected as definitely detrimental to the cause of national unity.

Dated February 7, 1949.

The American Transit Association, as the national organization of the transit industry, embracing some 300 companies employing nearly 500,000 people and serving more than 25,000,000,000,000 passengers, respectfully petitions the Congress to proceed with due deliberation, without preconceived prejudices of any sort, and on the basis of open hearings, to the enactment of new national labor laws.

In support of its position, the Association invites attention to the following:

The Wagner-Commercy Act was admittedly passed in a spirit of vindictiveness and partisanship, and administration. Not even its most ardent advocates have ever sought to defend it in accord with the American spirit of fair play and equality. It was a constant cause of bitterness and resentment by business, a fruitful source of controversy between labor and management, and an open invitation to oppression of the general public as the innocent victims of the disunity thereby caused.

The Taft-Hartley Act was enacted in response to public demand for improvement of the existing situation. A substantial number of the Democratic Members of the Senate and House voted therefor and again voted to override the Presidential veto thereof. Whatever its defects—and no one insofar as we know has claimed perfection for it—it at least attempted to re-establish the equality between labor and management, and to correct some of the demonstrated and admitted abuses which had arisen under the prior law.

The new labor law to be enacted by the Eighty-First Congress will defeat its purpose if it is not in accord with the American spirit of fair play and partisanship. Now, as before, do we need the further recognition of labor as the disunity which the then-existing situation. A substantial number of the Democratic Members of the Senate and House voted therefor and again voted to override the Presidential veto thereof. Whatever its defects—and no one insofar as we know has claimed perfection for it—it at least attempted to re-establish the equality between labor and management, and to correct some of the demonstrated and admitted abuses which had arisen under the prior law.

The Taft-Hartley Act was enacted in response to public demand for improvement of the existing situation. A substantial number of the Democratic Members of the Senate and House voted therefor and again voted to override the Presidential veto thereof. Whatever its defects—and no one insofar as we know has claimed perfection for it—it at least attempted to re-establish the equality between labor and management, and to correct some of the demonstrated and admitted abuses which had arisen under the prior law.

The new labor law to be enacted by the Eighty-First Congress will defeat its purpose if it is not in accord with the American spirit of fair play and partisanship. Now, as before, do we need the further recognition of labor as the disunity which the then-existing situation. A substantial number of the Democratic Members of the Senate and House voted therefor and again voted to override the Presidential veto thereof. Whatever its defects—and no one insofar as we know has claimed perfection for it—it at least attempted to re-establish the equality between labor and management, and to correct some of the demonstrated and admitted abuses which had arisen under the prior law.

The new labor law to be enacted by the Eighty-First Congress will defeat its purpose if it is not in accord with the American spirit of fair play and partisanship. Now, as before, do we need the further recognition of labor as the disunity which the then-existing situation. A substantial number of the Democratic Members of the Senate and House voted therefor and again voted to override the Presidential veto thereof. Whatever its defects—and no one insofar as we know has claimed perfection for it—it at least attempted to re-establish the equality between labor and management, and to correct some of the demonstrated and admitted abuses which had arisen under the prior law.

The new labor law to be enacted by the Eighty-First Congress will defeat its purpose if it is not in accord with the American spirit of fair play and partisanship. Now, as before, do we need the further recognition of labor as the disunity which the then-existing situation. A substantial number of the Democratic Members of the Senate and House voted therefor and again voted to override the Presidential veto thereof. Whatever its defects—and no one insofar as we know has claimed perfection for it—it at least attempted to re-establish the equality between labor and management, and to correct some of the demonstrated and admitted abuses which had arisen under the prior law.

The new labor law to be enacted by the Eighty-First Congress will defeat its purpose if it is not in accord with the American spirit of fair play and partisanship. Now, as before, do we need the further recognition of labor as the disunity which the then-existing situation. A substantial number of the Democratic Members of the Senate and House voted therefor and again voted to override the Presidential veto thereof. Whatever its defects—and no one insofar as we know has claimed perfection for it—it at least attempted to re-establish the equality between labor and management, and to correct some of the demonstrated and admitted abuses which had arisen under the prior law.
community and to its parent organization.

I ask unanimous consent that the important resolution which was sent to me be printed in the Congressional Record at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Welfare in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the Rules, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved, That New Milwaukee Aerie, No. 6197, Fraternal Order of Eagles, composed of 14,000 citizens of Milwaukee County, protest any curtailment of expenditures necessary for the proper care and rehabilitation of the men and women whose personal efforts and sacrifices preserved our American institutions, and made the continuance of our American way of life possible.

Resolved, That we protest any attempt to revert to conditions such as existed in 1938, especially when our Government finds money for the rehabilitation of other nations of the world, at the expense of our sick veterans at home, and beyond the borders.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators Wiley and McCarthy and Congressmen Biamiles and Zammuck so that they may be apprised of our position on this matter and be governed accordingly.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 714) to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authorities. The committee recommends the bill as amended, and appropriate amendments to the other bills so that they may be apprised of our position on this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCCAULIFFE. Mr. President, in executive session I reported favorably the nominations of Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Emil P. Peters, and William S. G. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 5) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ: S. 1196. A bill for the relief of Abe Lincoln and Elizabeth Lincoln, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: S. 1197. A bill to continue the relief of Phyllis Hertzog; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1198. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the ninetieth anniversary of the beginning of the petrologic industry in the United States, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1199. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works in the Allegheny River Basin at Warren, Youngsville, Shefield, Oil City, and Franklin, Pa., to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THYE: S. 1100. A bill to authorize $1,000 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY: S. 1101. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with the States of Montana to Nick Langager; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1102. A bill to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to compensation payable to individuals who went into hiding in order to avoid capture as prisoners of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. Lang), by request, introduced Senate bill 1103, to readjust postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.

By Mr. LANG, Mr. LEE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CAIN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MILLIKEN, and Mr. THREBB) introduced Senate bill 1104, to grant an allowance to the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.

By Mr. CARRAN: S. 1113. A bill to provide for the appointment of committees to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, or physical incapacity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KINNEY: S. 1114. A bill to provide a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. DOWNSEY, and Mr. KNOWLAND): S. 1115. A bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CAIN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MILLIKEN, and Mr. THREBB) introduced Senate bill 1116, to authorize an additional deduction in computing net income, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.

By Mr. JENNER: S. 1117. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals experiment station at Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLEY introduced Senate bill 1118, to encourage the prevention of steam pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of steam as a deduction in computing net income, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.

By Mr. MCCARRAN: S. 1119. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE: S. 1120. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to require an accounting for the expense allowance payable to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MCGHRATH: S. 1121. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request): S. 1122. A bill to amend section 1587 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of
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By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. DOWNER, Mr. McFARLAND, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 1140. A bill to authorize credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of the section of the Colorado River impounded between the lower Colorado River in Arizona, California, and Lower California, Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CTYON:

S. 1141. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States;

S. 1142. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loucks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution extending the time for completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; and

S. 1143. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loucks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BEADOUTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on February 21 the Postmaster General addressed a letter to the Vice President—a companion letter was sent to the Speaker of the House—calling attention to the fact that the President in his budget message referred to recurring postal deficits and urged that the Congress promptly enact an adequate revision of the postal rate structure.

With this letter, the Postmaster General submitted a suggested bill which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and I are introducing by request of the Postmaster General, reserv­ ing the right to favor or disfavor with any or all portions thereof. I may say that this proposed legislation has been discussed by the committee as a whole, and that is the position of each member.

However, it is felt that this bill should be promptly introduced and properly referred so that the subcommittee may start immediately hearings and other consideration of the provisions thereof, and those favoring and opposing this proposed legislation may have ample opportunity to be heard.

By request of the Postmaster General, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself, I introduce the bill.

The bill (S. 1103) to readjust postal rates, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. LANGER) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE TO NEXT OF KIN ATTENDING CERTAIN GROUP BURIALS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MalONE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Millikin], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thyde], and myself I introduce for appropriate refer­ ence a bill to grant travel and subsistence allowance to the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment, and I ask unanimous consent that the body of the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement with the bill, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1116) to grant travel and subsistence allowance to the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CAIN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. THYDE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Sec. 10. In the case of group or mass burials of the unidentified remains of one or more known individuals, the Secretary shall pay to each individual attending such burial (1) the actual traveling expenses of such next of kin from his place of residence to the place of burial and return, and (2) a per diem allowance, in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence, at the rates prescribed in the Subsistence Expense Act of 1936 and in conformity with regulations promulgated thereunder, for each day such next of kin is necessarily engaged in traveling to and from, and in attendance at, such burial. As used in this section the term 'next of kin' includes (1) both the spouse and children of a decedent, if the next of kin is a child of a decedent, (3) both parents of a decedent, if the next of kin is a parent, and (4) a grandchild of a decedent, if the next of kin of a decedent is a person standing in loco parentis."

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WILLIAMS

This bill would amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States,' approved May 1, 1946, as amended, so as to provide travel and subsistence allowances for the next of kin attending group burials of remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment.

The need for this legislation was first brought to my attention when my ailing mother appealed to me for assistance in connection with the return of her deceased son from the United States, and for his interment. The facts are these: her son, together with two other Air Force servicemen, had crashed to death in a Belgian Spitfire. The bodies, badly mangled, were interred in a single grave. The Army located the grave but could not distinguish the bodies and a mass burial at Arlington Cemetery was finally decided upon as the wisest course.
The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**PROVISIONS OF BILL**

The bill amends section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions allowed in computing net income, introduced by Mr. WILSON) and adds a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(bb) Cost of plants for treatment of industrial waste.—In the case of a taxpayer discharging (either directly or through public sewage systems) industrial waste into rivers or streams, the cost of new plants paid for during the taxable year for the construction of facilities (approved by the applicable State or Federal agency for pollution control) for the treatment of such waste, including amounts paid for plans for such construction and treatment."'

**INTRODUCTION OF BILL PROVIDING THAT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AGAINST STREAM POLLUTION BE TREATED DEDUCTIBLE AS BUSINESS EXPENSES**

I am introducing today a bill providing that capital improvements made to end stream pollution be directly treated as deductible business expenses for income-tax purposes. This bill is an identical measure to H. R. 43 already introduced by my friend and able colleague, the Honorable JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin. I feel that Congressman BYRNES is to be congratulated for his pioneering along this line.

I have been advised by the appropriate official of the Army that there are at least 1,000, and possibly as many as 4,000 cases in which bodies buried in temporary mass graves, or by crash or separation, have not been identified or separated, and when returned to this country must be reinterred in mass graves. I believe that the US. government has the choice of burial in the family cemetery or by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the circumstances necessitate a group burial, that each son cannot be interred in the home area of the respective families. The fact, news creates long travel by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the circumstances necessitate a group burial, it must be at their own expense.

I introduced this same legislation during the Eightieth Congress which was not considered by the Committee on Armed Services apparently because the Departments of the Army and Navy reported to the Bureau of the Budget recommending against its enactment.

The Vice President. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and possibly to the Committee on Finance.

Recently it was learned that the mother of one of the other sons, who lives in Colorado, was unable to follow this reasoning inasmuch as the facts concerning the mass burials where the bodies lay. It is circumstantial evidence that these boys were killed, necessitating a group burial, that each son cannot be interred by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the circumstances necessitate a group burial, it must be at their own expense.

I introduced this same legislation during the Eightieth Congress which was not considered by the Committee on Armed Services apparently because the Departments of the Army and Navy reported to the Bureau of the Budget recommending against its enactment on the ground that it would be discriminatory to furnish travel and subsistence to one group and to deny it to others. I am unable to follow this reasoning inasmuch as the facts concerning the mass burials where the bodies lay. It is circumstantial evidence that these boys were killed, necessitating a group burial, that each son cannot be interred by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the circumstances necessitate a group burial, it must be at their own expense.

I introduced this same legislation during the Eightieth Congress which was not considered by the Committee on Armed Services apparently because the Departments of the Army and Navy reported to the Bureau of the Budget recommending against its enactment on the ground that it would be discriminatory to furnish travel and subsistence to one group and to deny it to others.

I am unable to follow this reasoning inasmuch as the facts concerning the mass burials where the bodies lay. It is circumstantial evidence that these boys were killed, necessitating a group burial, that each son cannot be interred by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the circumstances necessitate a group burial, it must be at their own expense.

I introduced this same legislation during the Eightieth Congress which was not considered by the Committee on Armed Services apparently because the Departments of the Army and Navy reported to the Bureau of the Budget recommending against its enactment on the ground that it would be discriminatory to furnish travel and subsistence to one group and to deny it to others.

I am unable to follow this reasoning inasmuch as the facts concerning the mass burials where the bodies lay. It is circumstantial evidence that these boys were killed, necessitating a group burial, that each son cannot be interred by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the circumstances necessitate a group burial, it must be at their own expense.

I introduced this same legislation during the Eightieth Congress which was not considered by the Committee on Armed Services apparently because the Departments of the Army and Navy reported to the Bureau of the Budget recommending against its enactment on the ground that it would be discriminatory to furnish travel and subsistence to one group and to deny it to others.

I am unable to follow this reasoning inasmuch as the facts concerning the mass burials where the bodies lay. It is circumstantial evidence that these boys were killed, necessitating a group burial, that each son cannot be interred by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the circumstances necessitate a group burial, it must be at their own expense.

I introduced this same legislation during the Eightieth Congress which was not considered by the Committee on Armed Services apparently because the Departments of the Army and Navy reported to the Bureau of the Budget recommending against its enactment on the ground that it would be discriminatory to furnish travel and subsistence to one group and to deny it to others.

I am unable to follow this reasoning inasmuch as the facts concerning the mass burials where the bodies lay. It is circumstantial evidence that these boys were killed, necessitating a group burial, that each son cannot be interred by two of the mothers who must come from Colorado and Minnesota, respectively, and under the circumstances necessitate a group burial, it must be at their own expense.

I introduced this same legislation during the Eightieth Congress which was not considered by the Committee on Armed Services apparently because the Departments of the Army and Navy reported to the Bureau of the Budget recommending against its enactment on the ground that it would be discriminatory to furnish travel and subsistence to one group and to deny it to others.
PRESSURE ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

It is reported that there has been continuous pressure on the Department of Agriculture to lift the ban on importation of breeding stock from Brazil. Apparently the pressure is being exerted by the representatives of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, who have taken the position that it is time the United States government took steps to lift the ban on the importation of breeding stock from Brazil.

The Department of Agriculture has stated that it is not in the interest of the United States to lift the ban, because of the possibility of introducing foot-and-mouth disease into the United States. The Department has also stated that it is not in the interest of the United States to lift the ban, because of the possibility of introducing foot-and-mouth disease into the United States.

It is reported that the Department of Agriculture has been under pressure to lift the ban on importation of breeding stock from Brazil, because of the possibility of introducing foot-and-mouth disease into the United States. The Department has also stated that it is not in the interest of the United States to lift the ban, because of the possibility of introducing foot-and-mouth disease into the United States.
with the supine acquiescence of the Bureau of Animal Industry, a gamble was taken and the gamble was lost. Since that time, and in the absence of any effective means of coping with the constant outbreaks there be because of the importation of Argentine beef.

The proposal was submitted for approval to the Senate on June 6, 1935. Advocates of the change contended it would prevent the use of sanitary regulations as a disguised means of restriction of imports for protective purposes. This attempt to overthrow controls was not approved, but not until April 8, 1947, was the sanitary convention withdrawn, temporarily at least, by the President from Senate consideration.

Efforts to break down our sanitary embargo have been based wholly on economic grounds and pursued with disregard of grave consequences. Persons uninformed as to the nature and effects of the foot-and-mouth disease insist that Argentina makes to fight the disease, short and under the circumstances of the two laws when they later wish to import them into the United States. There is no proof that those animals have been there in freedom-from-exposure clause, they are eligible for importation into the United States.”

Sufficient to say that if the act of 1890 can be construed to circumvent the provisions of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act, your committee recommends that Congress enact any needed legislation to assuage the situation. The 1935 sanitary convention with Argentina was signed by our State Department in 1935. This was designed to change the position of this country and that of other countries who have similar regulations, for it provided that no further need of restricting imports, since the disease would be inside our gates.

The proposal was submitted for approval to the Senate on June 6, 1935. Advocates of the change contended it would prevent the use of sanitary regulations as a disguised means of restriction of imports for protective purposes. This attempt to overthrow controls was not approved, but not until April 8, 1947, was the sanitary convention withdrawn, temporarily at least, by the President from Senate consideration.

Efforts to break down our sanitary embargo have been based wholly on economic grounds and pursued with disregard of grave consequences. Persons uninformed as to the nature and effects of the foot-and-mouth disease insist that Argentina makes to fight the disease, short and under the circumstances of the two laws when they later wish to import them into the United States. There is no proof that those animals have been there in freedom-from-exposure clause, they are eligible for importation into the United States.”

Sufficient to say that if the act of 1890 can be construed to circumvent the provisions of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act, your committee recommends that Congress enact any needed legislation to assuage the situation. The 1935 sanitary convention with Argentina was signed by our State Department in 1935. This was designed to change the position of this country and that of other countries who have similar regulations, for it provided that no further need of restricting imports, since the disease would be inside our gates.
The disease would be more devastating here than in the Argentine. There the grass is humid and cattle do not have far to go for water. In this country most of our beef is raised on the southern and western ranges, where the forage is dry for months and cattle generally have to seek water. Under such conditions the losses here would be far greater.

Most of the beef cattle in the United States are raised from the home ranges to the Corn Belt for fattening on either grass or grain. Cattle with some months would not be able to eat grain. Thereby would be a repercussion of marketing because of State quarantine lines that certainly would be established. The indirect losses sustained by our economy would be greater than the direct losses.

DISEASE BARRIERS BROKEN DOWN

Another attempt to break down disease barriers was in October 1945, when Mexico received 140 head of Braun cattle from Brazil, a country where the disease is prevalent. The animals were landed on Sacrificios Island off Vera Cruz Harbor and in December 1945 were brought to the mainland.

According to a United States Department of Agriculture circular, 22 cattle were landed on Sacrificios Island on May 9, 1946. These were brought to the mainland on September 23, 1946. Special feed restrictions were placed on the importations of livestock from Mexico on June 6, 1946, but these were lifted on October 18 of that year, after an inspection of the cattle in the first shipment from Brazil.

At that time the cattle of the second shipment were still being examined only 6 months and still were potential carriers of the disease. Soon afterward the foot-and-mouth disease broke out in the area to which the second shipment had been shipped. On December 26 the United States Government reimposed restrictions on cattle shipments from Mexico to the United States. The United States Government on January 27, 1947, negotiated with Mexico a program to combat the disease. It did not provide for condemnation and burial in the zone of greatest infestation and thus it set up the seedbed for reinfection, which eventually would lead to its spread to the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it will be noted that outstanding representatives of the livestock industry, representing eight States from Iowa to California, are members of the advisory committee—advisory to the Secretary of Agriculture; and that following more than a year's study of the foot-and-mouth disease situation in the Western Hemisphere, the Department of Agriculture in the United States—that their recommendation for the repeal of the 1946 joint resolution establishing an international quarantine station on Swan Island was rejected.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES OF CERTAIN SENATE RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That any person who shall have served as an employee of the Senate and House of Representatives for 20 years or more shall be entitled, upon making application, to receive retirement pay at a rate equal to the rate of the basic compensation he was receiving at the time of his last active service in the Senate or House. Provided, That this resolution shall not apply to any person while he is receiving an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1940, or the revised act of October 17, 1950. Such retirement pay shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

SVC. The Secretary of the Senate shall determine eligibility for retirement pay under this resolution on the basis of records or secondary evidence. For such purposes, actual service in the Senate Restaurant shall be deemed to be service as an employee of such restaurant whether or not the person performing such service was carried on the payroll of the Senate. Provided that the time such service was performed, and any person performing such service for the major part of the time during which the Senate was in session in any calendar year shall be deemed to have performed a year's service as an employee of the Senate Restaurant during such calendar year.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (e) (3) "The status of officers and employees of the United States including their compensation, classification, and retirement," and subsection (e) (8) "The postal service generally, including the railway mail services and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic tube service" of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized during the period beginning March 1, 1946, and ending December 31, 1949, to authorize sessions and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SVC. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. JOHNSTON of Colorado. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to refer to the Committee on Judiciary certain bills which have heretofore been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Parliamentary has suggested that this should be in the form of a resolution rather than in the form of a motion. Therefore we have prepared it in the form of a resolution. I should like to have it acted upon at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MRS. LORRAINE MALONE—AMENDMENT

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 507) for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone, which was referred to the Committee on Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 326) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies and for other purposes, which was referred...
to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TAYLOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 2832) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was ordered to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 17, line 9, to strike out "$380,000" and insert "$350,000.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON WINYAH BAY, S.C. (S. DOC. NO. 21)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 14, 1949, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the report on Winyah Bay, S. C., and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER IN AND AROUND BRADFORD, PA. (S. DOC. NO. 20)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated April 16, 1949, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of a report on the upper Allegheny River in and around Bradford, Pa., and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—HEARINGS BEFORE SUB-COMMITTEE OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a hearing before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee will be held Wednesday, March 8, 1949, at 10 a.m., in the Judiciary Committee room for the purpose of taking additional testimony on Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, and which said resolution proposes to amend the Constitution by abolishing the electoral college as now constituted and providing a substitute therefor.

All interested parties are urged to attend said hearing.

PENSIONS FOR VETERANS—LETTER FROM KENNETH L. MYERS

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the body of the Record a letter written to me by Mr. Kenneth L. Myers, a prominent citizen of Nebraska, on the subject of veterans' pensions.

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


Senator Butler,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Butler: As a World War II veteran who went from grade of private to captain in 4 1/2 years of service of which over 2 1/2 years were overseas, I offer the following criticisms:

1. Because it is not only a duty but a privilege to defend a country like ours, the concept of pensions for non-service-connected disabilities in its essence negates the very sense of patriotic duty. Payment of non-service-connected disability pensions would constitute a mockery of the sacrifices of those who lie dead or those who are service incapacitated. I am a war veteran simply through the historical accident that I was of the age, occupational, and dependency status to be able to serve in the armed forces. I believe in an entitlement of a non-service-connected disability pension to those who lie dead or those who are service incapacitated. I am that we should not induce a young man to go to war for no reasons other than those of patriotism and service, but I believe in an entitlement of a non-service-connected disability pension to those who are disabled or those who are service incapacitated.

2. If the concept of pensions as a reward for war service is just, then it is just that such pensions be proportionate to the services performed for which such a service was rendered.

To grant the same pension rewards to those who served only 90 days (and who probably never heard a shot fired in anger) as to those who served 5, 10, 15, or 20 times 90 days is to actually place a premium on minimum service of any sort. If this bill is passed, I can hear the shouts of "I told you so, sucker" throughout the land. And this shout will be made by the boys who sought every possibility of avoiding service to the many who answered the call by volunteering or joining units which would be called long before they otherwise would have had to serve. Surely no one could contend that such an evaluation of service is in the interest of either national defense or justice.

It is my sincere hope that the Congress will refuse to be misled by the professional lobbyists who attempt to represent the voice of American veterans.

Sincerely,

Kenneth L. Myers.
ONE HUNDRED DOLLAR DinNERS FOR PRIVILEGED FEW—ARTICLE BY JOHN M. CUMMINGS

Mr. M. asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "One Hundred Dollar Democratic Dinners Bring Out 'Privileged Few'" written by John M. Cummings and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.

FEDERAL AID TO DELAWARE—EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Journal of December 28, 1948, on the subject of Federal Aid to the State of Delaware, which appears in the Appendix.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The President Can't Shift the Blame," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.

Blame!

Mr. CALHUN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter to the Editor, relating to the nomination of Hon. Mon. C. Wallgren to be Director of the National Security Resources Board, which appear in the Appendix.

FILIBUSTER IN THE SENATE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. CALHUN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record editorials from the Milwaukee Journal and the Los Angeles Times, which appear in the Appendix.

HEALTH INSURANCE FACTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE OHIOAN TRAMSTER

Mr. MORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Oregonian, reprinted from the Oregonian, reprinted from the Oregonian, which appear in the Appendix.

COOPERATIVE HEALTH PLANS IN TAMPA—ARTICLE BY ANGUS LAIRD

Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Cooperative Health Plans in Tampa," by Angus Laird, reprinted from the July 1947 issue of Medical Care, which appears in the Appendix.

FILIBUSTER—EDITORIAL FROM CHARLESTON (W. VA.) GAZETTE

Mr. NELLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Filibuster," published in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of February 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article from the Harvard Law School Record of February 9, 1949, being an analysis of Chinese-American relations by Prof. Rosco Pound, which appears in the Appendix.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on February 17 of this year the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported a resolution amending the so-called cloiture rule of the Senate. That resolution is now on the calendar, and is known as Senate Resolution 15. The authors of the resolution are the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. WALKER) and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senator from Arizona (Mr. HAYDEN).

Before moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution, this amendment to the cloture rule. As majority leader, I desire to make my position very clear. After long study of this problem, I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible to delete from it firmly and must reach a definite conclusion at this session of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have order? I have been endeavoring to hear, but I cannot hear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been endeavoring to obtain order and to keep order. If Senators must converse, they must retire to the cloakroom. The Senate is about to enter upon an important discussion, and the Senate will be in order. The Chair feels sure that Senators will cooperate in the atmosphere to be present here on the floor for consideration, debate, and finally a vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not know that an amendment of that sort will be offered; and has not he had notice served by a distinguished leader on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORE), that he will present such a motion; and does not the Senator from Illinois also understand that the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORE) will propose amendments in the nature described by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that both the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MYRIS) will propose amendments of the nature described by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. And supported by the Senator from Illinois?

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois be kind enough to yield to me again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator for another question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state that the Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the Chair invoke that rule before the motion to take up the cloture resolution is made, so that we may not have a brief discussion of the matter in advance? No Member of the Senate has invoked the rule as to yielding only for questions; and in this brief preliminary discussion, before we embark upon consideration of the time when this amendment to the Senator from Illinois will make, it does seem that we might be permitted some brief latitude for a moment or two in developing what I consider to be some very important considerations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate rule does not apply only to this situation. It is frequently violated, more or
less by unanimous consent; but under no circumstances during the consideration of a measure is a Senator permitted to yield to any except for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the distinguished President of the Senate intend to invoke that rule during the proceedings generally?

The Vice President. The Chair will endeavor to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it is to be applied in all cases I shall endeavor to confine my remarks to questions.

I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if I have been correctly informed by representatives of the press associations that the Senator from Illinois on leaving the White House this morning stated to the press that the President of the United States was insisting that the Senate keep before it until it is disposed of and adopted the proposal to amend the cloture rule of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend from Georgia that the President of the United States is wholeheartedly behind this. The Senate will act with expedition and dispatch in disposing of it. He certainly supports those who now seek to amend the cloture rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether the President of the United States favors cloture by a two-thirds vote, or whether he favors applying cloture by a majority vote, as advocated by the Americans for Democratic Action, the PAC, and other minority groups who are putting the United States to the test of whether or not that embraces the views of the President of the United States with respect to the change in the Senate rule.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, if he desires to answer that question.

The Vice President. The Senate cannot go on to the Senator from Pennsylvania for any purpose except for the asking of a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be permitted to ask the question of the Senator from Georgia.

The Vice President. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The Vice President. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MYERS. I may say to the majority leader, I have never discussed this problem with the President of the United States. I do not know whether the President of the United States favors a two-thirds or a constitutional majority. However, I think the Senator from Georgia should know that, at the first opportunity I had before the Committee on Rules and Administration to secure a vote, I amended my original resolution so as to provide for a constitutional majority, and the committee voted that down, I believe, by 10 to 2, or 9 to 2, or something of the kind. I repeat, I propose at the very first opportunity to offer the present resolution an amendment providing for a vote by a constitutional majority.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

The Vice President. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 15) amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President—

The Vice President. Before recognizing the Senator from Arizona, chairman of the committee, the Chair wishes to make further information and advice of the Senate in regard to procedure in debate.

In the first place, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution or resolution cannot be amended by a motion to take up some bill in lieu of the one which is the subject of the pending motion.

During debate on a motion of this sort, which is debatable, or on any other motion or matter which may be pending, the rules of the Senate provide that a Senator can yield to another Senator only for the purpose of permitting another Senator to ask him a question. If he yields for any other purpose and running debate ensues, which frequently happens, more or less by unanimous consent, and in violation of the rules, he may be taken from the floor by reason of the violation of the rule. The floor cannot be yielded to the purpose of allowing some other Senator to make a point of no quorum and having a roll call, without losing the floor, and when the Senate is proceeding under the rule, in which there is a limitation of two speeches on any subject, if a Senator loses the floor by reason of such procedure, and is again recognized, he is speaking the second time on the pending proposal.

The Chair makes that statement because Senators are entitled not only to know their own rights but to know the rights of other Senators and the limitations which are imposed by the rules of debate, which are supposed to be universally observed, but which are violated by unanimous consent because the matter involved is not important or may not require long discussion and therefore the objection is not made that the rule is being violated.

The question as to the function of the Chair in enforcing the rules of the Senate without a point of order being made is one to which the present occupant of the chair has given considerable consideration. The present occupant of the chair feels it is his duty and his function in part to facilitate the prompt transaction of the Senate's business. The Chair recognizes that frequently one Senator may dislike to make a point of order against another Senator who has the floor, even though he may be violating the rule or may be yielding for a general running debate, or for other purposes, because of personal relationships or other reasons. The Chair feels that he is obligated to the body as a whole so that he can in observance of the rules and in protection of the Members of the Senate in the enjoyment of their rights, to observe and enforce the rules wherever he feels they are being violated.

The Chair feels certain the Members of the Senate will cooperate in the matter of keeping order in the Senate and in observing the rules. He wishes in no instance to have it understood that any ruling he makes is directed to any particular Senator who at the moment may be occupying the floor or any Senator who may be seeking to interrupt another Senator who occupies the floor. For that reason the Chair has felt it is his duty to make this preliminary statement. He may yield for the purpose of allowing some other Senators, and not to any particular Senator.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a parliamentary inquiry, in order that we may understand clearly what the Chair proposes to invoke?
Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize that by unanimous consent the Senator from Arizona may permit the Senator from Georgia to ask the Chair a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Chair the effect of a Senator's yielding in order that he might yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules, the yielding of a Senator for the purpose of permitting another Senator to ask a question must be done by the Senator who has the floor. He cannot yield for a question. He may yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yield only for a question.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the Chair means a Senator can yield only for a question. He cannot yield for a running debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the yielding of a Senator for the purpose of permitting another Senator to ask a question must be done by the Senator who has the floor. He cannot yield for a question. He may yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yield only for a point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the Chair means a Senator can yield only for a question. He cannot yield for a running debate. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to yield to the Senator from Georgia to ask the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a Senator may yield only for a point of order. He cannot yield for a question. He can yield only for a point of order.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot possibly anticipate every situation which may arise that would offer an opportunity for Senators having the floor to yield for some purpose. The question would be entirely whether the Chair in possession of the floor to lose the floor. Otherwise, there are given to the Senator in possession of the floor rights he does not have under some of the rules of the Senate at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is entirely possible. Therefore the Chair must not decide to pass on each question as it arises, depending upon the circumstances.

Mr. RUSSELL. It may be that there are conditions in which a point of order can be decided by a Senator in possession of the floor without losing the floor. Either otherwise, there are given to the Senator in possession of the floor rights he does not have under some of the rules of the Senate at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is entirely possible. Therefore the Chair must not decide to pass on each question as it arises, depending upon the circumstances.

Mr. RUSSELL. If this instance, the Chair determines he has himself to suspend the rules on the Senate as to the ruling in certain instances. Some of us who are interested in discussing the subject before the Senate are entitled to know, I think, what the Chair is going to rule on points of order when they are submitted by Senators on the floor; just how far the Senator having the floor shall go to protect his rights; whether he shall have the assistance of the Chair. The Chair has the power to act in such a manner as will not be interpreted in the course of our remarks and taken off our feet, placed in our seats, and lose the floor, because a point of order was made by some other Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was attempting to advise the Senate with reference to the rules governing debate as he understands them to be a part of the rules of the Senate for many years, though violated frequently, as the Chair has said, under proceedings which might be regarded as under unanimous consent. Obviously, the Chair cannot anticipate every decision he would render under every possible circumstance. But the Chair felt that he should make some statement, inasmuch as the Senate is entering upon an important debate, in order not only that new Senators, but others who have not, probably, participated in a controversial debate of any length, know what the rules are and what the rights of their colleagues are.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of us are exceedingly anxious to know what our rights will be under the rulings of the Chair, and are jealous to protect rights we know we have heretofore enjoyed. I was therefore trying to get the Chair to elucidate his points of order, because the Chair had never before understood that a point of order in all cases could be controlled by a Senator having the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So long as a Senator having the floor is debating under the rules of the Senate, he cannot be interrupted by a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Presiding Officer will remember that pronouncement during the course of the debate. I know there are times when efforts are made to interrupt Senators who have the floor by interposing points of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I now grant myself unanimous consent to proceed. 

The issue now before the Senate is not partisan. The proof of that is that the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska, has been friendly to me in the presentation of the pending resolution, and the resolution was reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration by the voices of members of both political parties who recommended that it do pass.

Every Senator on both sides of the aisle completely agrees that the Senate should place a man whose share in the course of our remarks and taken off our feet, placed in our seats, and lose the floor, because a point of order was made by some other Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was attempting to advise the Senate with reference to the rules governing debate as he understands them to be a part of the rules of the Senate for many years, though violated frequently, as the Chair has said, under proceedings which might be regarded as under unanimous consent. Obviously, the Chair cannot anticipate every decision he would render under every possible circumstance. But the Chair felt that he should make some statement, inasmuch as the Senate is entering upon an important debate, in order not only that new Senators, but others who have not, probably, participated in a controversial debate of any length, know what the rules are and what the rights of their colleagues are.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of us are exceedingly anxious to know what our rights will be under the rulings of the Chair, and are jealous to protect rights we know we have heretofore enjoyed. I was therefore trying to get the Chair to elucidate his points of order, because the Chair had never before understood that a point of order in all cases could be controlled by a Senator having the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So long as a Senator having the floor is debating under the rules of the Senate, he cannot be interrupted by a point of order.
Resolved, that rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended as follows:

Insert after the words "to lay on the table" in rule XXII the following:

"Any Senator arising in his place and asserting that, in his opinion, an attempt is being made on the floor of the Senate to obstruct, hinder, or delay the right of the Senator to proceed to a vote, the Chair shall, without permitting any debate thereon, put the question to the Senate of the Senator that an attempt is being made to obstruct, hinder, or delay a vote? And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative, then it shall be in order, to the exclusion of the consideration of all other questions, for any Senator to move to fix a time for voting on the pending bill or resolution and all amendments thereto; and the said motion shall be decided without debate: Provided, however, that such the said motion for taking the vote on the pending bill or resolution and all amendments thereto shall be at least two calendar days after the day on which said motion is made."

On the following day the resolution was reported adversely from the Committee on Rules and no further action was taken on it. The effect of the rule would have been to make it possible to hold that previous question on any bill or resolution to take effect two or more days thereafter.

It must be remembered in this connection that for the 6 years immediately preceding his arrival in the Senate, Senator Williams had served as minority leader in the House of Representatives, and was, therefore, accustomed to assist in the prompt disposal of legislation. He was, no doubt, irked by extended debate and proposed that it could be brought to an end after 2 days' notice.

It is difficult to believe that at any time there could have been two Senators from Mississippi who favored cloture by a majority vote, yet such was once the case. I have shown that the senior Senator from that State, Mr. Williams, submitted a resolution that was disposed of in the manner I have described. I now quote extracts from the remarks of the Junior Senator, Mr. Vardaman, made on the day that the present rule XXII was adopted.

I wish to say in the outset that there is no greater necessity for cloture in the Senate today than has existed for the last quarter of a century. Certainly not since I became a Member of this very honorable body. I am for this resolution not because of anything that has happened in the immediate past, nor because of anything that has been done or has been left undone by the last session of Congress. I am for it because I am of the same opinion that there should be a rule limiting debate—a rule by which questions can be brought before the Senate for final determination whether it meets the approval of all the Senators or not.

I think this resolution ought to pass—Referring to rule XXII.

It guarantees ample time for full and complete discussion, and after that is had there ought to be the vote. I have always been in favor of cloture, and if you adopt that the rule would provide for the invocation of the cloture by a majority rather than by a two-thirds vote. I believe in majority rule, I have been ready to vote.
Resolved, That the Senate will adopt the standing rules of the Senate of the 65th Congress as reported to the Senate and agreed to on May 16, 1916.

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate of the 66th Congress, as adopted on March 8, 1917, be in force and effect during the session of the Senate held at the beginning of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

The 65th Congress held a session on May 16, 1916, at which time the Senate adopted Rule XXII as reported to the Senate and agreed to on May 16, 1916, and there was discussion in regard to it on two different occasions but no further action was taken during the Sixty-fourth Congress.

The present rule XXII was adopted on March 8, 1917, at a session of the Senate held at the beginning of the Sixty-fifth Congress. The rule was drafted by a committee of five Senators from the Democratic conference and five Senators from the Republican conference.

There is no record of their names, but there is no doubt that among the 10 there were Senators who had been members of the Committee on Rules during the last Congress. To clearly indicate that the resolution reported to the Senate on May 16, 1916, was used as the basis for rule XXII as adopted on March 8, 1917, the Senate may issue in the Record a copy of the rule with the differences between it and the 1916 resolution printed in italics.

There being no objection, the copies were ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

RULE XXII

Resolved, That the Senate adopt the standing rules of the Senate of the 65th Congress as reported to the Senate and agreed to on May 16, 1916, with the following exceptions:

1. At any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to close debate upon a pending measure received by the President and transmitted to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, at once, state the motion to the Senate, and case, and, after the Senator who made the motion had been given an opportunity to explain his views and state his purpose, the Senator shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said shall be the decision of the Senate, and the resolution thereto.

2. If the previous question is to be brought to a close, the President shall place the question before the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said shall be the decision of the Senate, and the resolution thereto.

3. If the previous question is not to be brought to a close, the President shall place the question before the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is the motion made by Senator (name) to revise and amend the resolution before the Senate, to be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motions as to the amendment of a bill which is the unfinished business of the Senate.

The committee resolution used the term "a Senator" to refer to the President, but the rule refers to "the bill and amendments thereto." The substitute resolution was placed on the Senate Calendar on May 16, 1916, and there was discussion in regard to it on two different occasions but no further action was taken during the Sixty-fourth Congress.

The present rule XXII was adopted on March 8, 1917, at a session of the Senate held at the beginning of the Sixty-fifth Congress. The rule was drafted by a committee of five Senators from the Democratic conference and five Senators from the Republican conference.

There is no record of their names, but there is no doubt that among the 10 there were Senators who had been members of the Committee on Rules during the last Congress. To clearly indicate that the resolution reported to the Senate on May 16, 1916, was used as the basis for rule XXII as adopted on March 8, 1917, the Senate may issue in the Record a copy of the rule with the differences between it and the 1916 resolution printed in italics.

There being no objection, the copies were ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

RULE XXII

Resolved, That the Senate adopt the standing rules of the Senate of the 65th Congress as reported to the Senate and agreed to on May 16, 1916, with the following exceptions:

1. At any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to close debate upon a pending measure received by the President and transmitted to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, at once, state the motion to the Senate, and case, and, after the Senator who made the motion had been given an opportunity to explain his views and state his purpose, the Senator shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said shall be the decision of the Senate, and the resolution thereto.

2. If the previous question is to be brought to a close, the President shall place the question before the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said shall be the decision of the Senate, and the resolution thereto.

3. If the previous question is not to be brought to a close, the President shall place the question before the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is the motion made by Senator (name) to revise and amend the resolution before the Senate, to be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motions as to the amendment of a bill which is the unfinished business of the Senate.

The committee resolution used the term "a Senator" to refer to the President, but the rule refers to "the bill and amendments thereto." The substitute resolution was placed on the Senate Calendar on May 16, 1916, and there was discussion in regard to it on two different occasions but no further action was taken during the Sixty-fourth Congress.

The present rule XXII was adopted on March 8, 1917, at a session of the Senate held at the beginning of the Sixty-fifth Congress. The rule was drafted by a committee of five Senators from the Democratic conference and five Senators from the Republican conference.

There is no record of their names, but there is no doubt that among the 10 there were Senators who had been members of the Committee on Rules during the last Congress. To clearly indicate that the resolution reported to the Senate on May 16, 1916, was used as the basis for rule XXII as adopted on March 8, 1917, the Senate may issue in the Record a copy of the rule with the differences between it and the 1916 resolution printed in italics.

There being no objection, the copies were ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

RULE XXII

Resolved, That the Senate adopt the standing rules of the Senate of the 65th Congress as reported to the Senate and agreed to on May 16, 1916, with the following exceptions:

1. At any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to close debate upon a pending measure received by the President and transmitted to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, at once, state the motion to the Senate, and case, and, after the Senator who made the motion had been given an opportunity to explain his views and state his purpose, the Senator shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said shall be the decision of the Senate, and the resolution thereto.

2. If the previous question is to be brought to a close, the President shall place the question before the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said shall be the decision of the Senate, and the resolution thereto.

3. If the previous question is not to be brought to a close, the President shall place the question before the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is the motion made by Senator (name) to revise and amend the resolution before the Senate, to be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motions as to the amendment of a bill which is the unfinished business of the Senate.

The committee resolution used the term "a Senator" to refer to the President, but the rule refers to "the bill and amendments thereto." The substitute resolution was placed on the Senate Calendar on May 16, 1916, and there was discussion in regard to it on two different occasions but no further action was taken during the Sixty-fourth Congress.
In truth, every member of that committee was a man of ability and possessed of ample experience as a Senator or Representative, competent to determine what kind of a rule should be adopted to limit debate in the Senate.

In 1916, as a Member of the House of Representatives, he was not, though not intimately, with every one of the Senators to whom I have referred. There are three others in this Chamber today who literally were serving in the House in 1891; Thaddeus Stevens, the Senator from Pennsylvania; Mr. McKellar, and the Senator from West Virginia. Mr. Nesely, I am sure that each of them will bear witness with me in saying that every member of the then Senate Committee on Rules was a noted Senator for whose judgment other Senators had high regard. The Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally, who came to the House of Representatives in 1917, also knew most of them as being at that time among the leaders of the Senate.

So, I ask you to do with the adoption of the cloture amendment to rule XXII in 1917. The first was Thomas S. Martin, of Virginia, the majority leader, who obtained unanimous consent for cloture. He had then been a Senator for 12 years.

The other was Charles Curtis, of Kansas, the Republican whip, who later became Vice President during the Coolidge administration. Both of those Senators knew all of the ins and outs of how the Senate does its work. Each of them was highly respected for his political common sense.

Mr. President, knowing those men and the reputation they bore for integrity and fair dealing, I do not believe they helped to write a rule, and urged its adoption, which they knew was defective, and which time has proved to be valuable.

In view of the repeated assertions that the requirement of a two-thirds majority to close debate in the Senate is unfair and undemocratic, I have, leave a statement that I was a member of the then Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on January 24, when the hearings began on the several cloture resolutions which had been referred to that committee. At that time I said:

In any event this committee must always remember that under the most favorable circumstances a two-thirds majority will be necessary to amend the existing rule. From a practical standpoint the burden of proof rests heavily upon those who advocate majority cloture. They must not only demonstrate why it should be done but how it can be done.

In connection with permitting the majority to rule on all measures pending before the Senate there is a significant fact which this committee cannot afford to overlook. Unlike the House of Representatives, a quorum in the Senate is wholly without reference to the total population of the United States. There is a situation that cannot be changed by an act of Congress since the Constitution provides that "no Senator shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The Constitution, therefore, does not give recognition, in all cases, to the right of the majority to rule in the Senate.

At the time when rule XXII was adopted, there were 34 Members of the Senate who had had previous service in the House of Representatives. Frequent reference is made to the great differences...
which exist between the rules that have been adopted to regulate procedure in the two bodies at either end of the Capitol. It is obvious that time will not permit us to have unlimited freedom of debate as can be accorded to 96 Senators. Of the 96 Senators at that time, 34 of them, as I have said, were former Members of the House of Representatives. I have no doubt that many of them felt as I did when I first came to this body from the House of Representatives. I must frankly confess that I did not like the way the House of Representatives was carried on. I had been for 15 years in the other body, and I had come to rely upon its very able leadership, which took care of what was happening. Afterward, in thinking it over, I reached the conclusion that I must have arrived at the same state of mind as did the German people when the result of the First World War relieved them of domination by the Kaiser. They had become so accustomed to being told what they could do and what was "verboten" that they did not know what to do with the liberty and freedom which was thrust upon them when Hitler came along to tell them what he was the one to do their thinking for them, they welcomed him with great relief.

That situation is similar to the one in which I found myself; and it took me some time to realize the freedom which I had as a United States Senator. I would come upon the floor of the Senate expecting to offer an amendment to a bill, but would find some other Senator occupying the floor for an hour or two before I could have an opportunity to say anything or do anything about what I had in mind. Perhaps I would even have to wait a day. That could not happen in the House of Representatives. But as time went on, I became firmly convinced that I was mistaken, and that there is value in the rules here in the Senate.

In his argument before the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morgan) indicated his firm conviction that the custom of courtesy and consideration for the rights of all Senators which became well established during the long period of time when there was no limitation of debate in the Senate will remain unimpaired as a strong bulwark to protect the opportunity of any minority in the Senate to fully and freely state its position before a vote is taken on any pending legislation. Therefore, he favors a majority rule. It does not require much imagination to see how that custom of senatorial courtesy and consideration was originally established and why it has remained in effect down to this day. More than a century ago, when a new Senator came into this body, it did not take him long to learn that there were other Senators who not only had the ability to point out what they deemed to be the errors of any resolution or the false statement of the facts upon which his conclusions were based, but, above all that, the other Senators could take whatever it was that you might not have the courage to fully expose the flaws in your reasoning and the errors in what he had presented as the facts. There was no way available to him to stop the criticism of his ideas by other Senators so long as they desired to do so. That was a right that they possessed, which he was compelled to respect, and from it very natural consequences resulted. It was the same kind of opposition that all Senators, each of whom had that right. It is inherent in human nature to have respect for power. The new Senator's ability to point out what he deemed to be errors in what you had presented would continue to prevail in the Senate during the years to come.

If the 25 to 50 Senators who happen to be present may at any time determine that they wish to continue a debate, to talk, and can compel a vote to be taken then and there, will courtesy and consideration for the minority continue to prevail in this body? A parliamentary procedure of that kind automatically reduces the power and the influence of every individual Senator. It takes nothing but common sense to know that the power will go to the one who can carry on the debate longest. That was a right that the new Senator would have in the House of Representatives. But as time went on, I became firmly convinced that I was mistaken, and that there is value in the rules here in the Senate.

In conclusion, let me repeat what I said in the beginning that all the Committee on Rules and Administration recommends is that the present rule XXII be made effective. It is not criticizing the principles upon which that rule was founded, that custom or tradition will continue to prevail in this body. The question is whether, with the destruction of the basis upon which it was founded, that custom or tradition will continue to prevail in the Senate during the years to come.

That such a result was not intended is further substantiated by the fact that no statement on the adoption of anything or on any Senator voting against the adoption of the resolution offered on March 8, 1947, by Mr. Martin, of Virginia, were in support of the assumption that the adoption of that resolution would result in effective cloture, and no other Senator indicated to them that such a change in rule XXII would not accomplish that purpose.

It was perfectly clear to me that Senator La Follette thought at that time the Senate of the United States was adopting a cloture rule, it would be applicable on all occasions.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. There can be no doubt about that at all.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator stated in the early part of his argument that he believes rule XXII, with the amendment as proposed, is basically sound, if I remember his words.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator then went on to a considerable discussion about the two-thirds rule. Of course, the committee makes no recommendation of a change in the two-thirds part of rule XXII. My question is, Does the Senator believe that the rule, with the amendment, leaving the two-thirds vote as it is, is a workable rule, or does he recommend that proposal because he believes it is the practical thing to do?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that rule XXII is basically sound. There is no question about that, if we stop to consider the problem. Senators do not represent population. The popular vote is cared for at the other side of the Capitol. Sen-
ators represent States, large States, small States. There could not have been a Union, had not each State been given an equal representation in this body. It is easy to conceive the time when one more than one-half the Senate, representing a very minor fraction of the population, would be in a position to do serious injury to the most populous parts of the country.

For all those reasons it is sound that the rule should be two-thirds. It should be a two-thirds majority in order to protect the interest of Senators themselves in their freedom of debate. I believe in the rule as written, the way it was reported by the committee, it should be adopted without any change. I mean by that to say that it is basically sound in all its features.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, Mr. HAYDEN, whether, if the Senate adopts Resolution 15 as reported from the committee, he feels satisfied that that will close all the loopholes that may exist in rule XXII? In other words, this is a question that, had it been asked in 1917, might at least have prevented us from getting into this difficulty. Does the Senate now feel that this closes all the loopholes?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have consulted the best parliamentarians that were available, and as I understand it, at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Taft), the word "infinite" was inserted for good measure. The way the rule is written, it is tight enough and strong enough to do the work expected of it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question that perhaps he has already answered but which I should merely like to emphasize for the record?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator feel that the present suggested change should be tried out because he believes it will obliterate that battle of "infinite"ness" that was enterred for good measure. The way it was written, it is tight enough and strong enough to do the work expected of it?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do. Suppose some measure, some motion, some subject, is pending before the Senate. The Senate has the right, upon the filing of a petition signed by 15 Senators, to determine by a two-thirds vote whether debate shall be closed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I tried to bring that out in order to emphasize that the Senator believes that it is a basically sound rule, rather than the constitutional majority rule, and that he voted for it not only in theory, but because he believes that it is the right thing to do rather than merely the practical thing to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senators who took the time and trouble, after 2 years of study, of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, to write legislators and they did a satisfactory piece of work, except that they did not look beyond the difficulties which had theretofore confronted them. Necessary to the mother of invention. After that action had been taken, someone else found that in order to accomplish his purpose and permit unlimited debate, he could use other means. We are trying to produce a good, sound rule under which in no circumstances will it be possible to prevent the filing of a cloture petition and close debate.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not guarantee that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it was my purpose, if permitted by action of the Senate, to call for a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator having the floor cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator ask for unanimous consent of the Senate to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I believe I will not yield for that purpose, for the reason that the distinguished occupant of the chair has laid down the strict rules, and I think it is my duty to abide by the rules and proceed with the debate accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska decline to yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Florida, however, for his effort.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is the strongest citadel for freedom in the whole world. It is a great honor to be a Senator in the Senate, and it is also a great responsibility.

The Members of the Senate have a glorious heritage to carry forward, and I am sure that the Members of this Congress are fully aware of our responsibilities, and fully appreciate the many burdens that are being thrust upon us.

Certainly, in the last few years, the duties of a United States Senator have been greatly increased. The growth of our country, the place which it has taken in leadership among the nations of the world, have brought up many vital and complex problems to solve. While I do not wish to infer that Senators back in history had little to do, yet, certainly, all can agree that during the last quarter of a century there has been a large increase in the work of the Senate. Much of this has been self-made by expanding the powers of the Federal Government.

With Congress now in session most of each year, as compared to the length of the sessions in past years, when for many months the Congress was not in session, it requires no elaboration to point out that the duties of a United States Senator, and of the Senate as a whole, have been vastly increased.

It is quite obvious, too, that our responsibility in helping to shape a lasting peace for the world has greatly expanded our duties.

Mr. President, I make reference to the greatly expanded activities of the Senate as part of the background for the observations I desire to make in support of the motion by the senior Senator from Arizona (Mr. HAYDEN) now pending before the Senate; that is, the immediate consideration of a resolution to amend subsection 2 of Senate standing rule XXII, relating to cloture.

There are those who say there is nothing new that can be said on the subject of cloture. That is an observation which is usually made by observers as they are on the run.

I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that the pressure upon the Senate for decisions during recent years has been increasing at a tremendous rate. Certainly as the acting majority leader for the past 2 years, I know something about that pressure.

Regardless of these pressures, it would be tragic beyond description if this body ever adopted a rule of procedure that would deny to any Senator an opportunity to be heard on any matter brought before the Senate. I would never be in favor of that.

The Senate has been frequently referred to as the great citadel of liberty in the world. I know I speak the sentiments of every Senator when I say we all hope that it shall forever maintain that reputation. In no legislative body in the whole world will it be possible to deliberate more fully protected and guarded than it is in the Senate.

The minority has rights that are just as inviolable as those of the majority. The truth of that statement goes to the very form and substance of our republican system of government.

We can cite many instances in our history of reforms or great steps forward for our people often begin through the advocacy of small minorities that gradually, through the years, swell into majorities. In time, ideas for advancement that were almost universally frowned upon in years past come to be taken for granted as right and proper.

There have been notable instances in which waves of enthusiasm for legislation or actions by the Senate have given way to waves of enthusiasm for their opponents. After the proposal had been thoroughly debated, and fully discussed, and understood by the people.

Therefore, plainly, we should take no action for revision of the rules that would in any way foreclose wholesome and necessary debate and thorough exploration of controversial questions that come before us. Upon that proposition I feel sure every Member of this body fully agrees.

I do not want the Senate rules to permit the odious steamroller to crush the right of minorities to be heard and to be given every opportunity to persuade others to conversion to their views. In recent years we had a striking example of how the freedom of debate and freedom of deliberation in the Senate serve as a bulwark against revolution in our Government. I refer to the so-called Supreme Court-packing proposal was made in 1937.

It was not my honor and privilege to be a Member of this body at that time, but that great moment in our history is fresh in all of our minds. It is conceivable that similar proposals disastrous
to our republican way of life, may be made in the future. Some of them are on our doorstep today. But I remind Senators that the unfortunate Supreme Court-packing proposal never reached the stage in the Senate where resort to cloture was invoked.

The historic processes of the Senate committees and full publicity, worked so well that that threat to our form of government was averted by utter rot of the forces that had advocated the proposal.

I should apply the faith I have in the confidence and wisdom of the Senate to adhere to its traditional character. Ours is a unique body as governments are constituted.

It has been said time and again, and I believe it is true, that the framers of the Constitution of the United States were divinely inspired.

The drafters of the Constitution gave to the Senate, a vital part in the making of our Nation's foreign policy. It is quite apparent to all of us that the work of the Senate is now of great importance. Its work has been greatly increased in recent years, until today its ramification and impact dominates largely what we do in regard to domestic matters.

In Senate Resolution 15, the so-called Hayden-Wherry resolution, my views are in no way influenced by partisan considerations. We are considering now rules of procedure to provide fair and equitable consideration and action, upon matters that come before the Senate for determination. We are considering rules of the game—so to speak. These rules are fair and play like the ethics of conduct for citizens in our country and like the rules that govern in the field of sport.

We are now considering rules to be handed down through the years, and I believe that the more we exclude partisan consideration, the better will we do our work. It was with that thought in mind that I was invited by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I joined the senior Senator from Arizona (Mr. HAYDEN) in sponsoring Senate Resolution 15. In writing the cloture rule transcends all party considerations. Partisanship went out the window when the Senate, in 1917, as has already been stated by the majority leader, adopted standing rule XXII. It was a committee of Republicans and Democrats who drafted the rule. It was adopted by a vote of 76 to 3, March 8, 1917, with Senator Robert La Follette of the country "voting for it—from the North, the South, the East, and the West.

Much will be said during debate upon the pending motion pro and con, on the wisdom of application of the cloture rule at various times since its adoption. Statistics will be given to prove or disprove arguments. The melancholy history of this measure will be retold by the proponents will be cited, and there will be disputes over their bearing on present circumstances.

For my part, I should like to consider Senate Resolution 15 in connection with conditions today—now—and with thought to the future.

Today, we do not have any effective rule to invoke cloture on any legislation or treaty that may come before the Senate in the future. I make that positive, affirmative statement, we do not have an effective cloture rule today. Standing rule XXII, the so-called cloture rule, is now a dead letter. It is supposed to be a motion to invoke another cloture rule, which has been made by the President pro tempore [Mr. VANDENBERG] in the Senate on August 2, 1948.

The senior Senator from Michigan made the ruling according to his lights. He ruled as he saw the precedents and as he construed the language of standing rule XXII—that those two little but decisive words—pending measure. That was his duty and he honorably carried out his responsibility, regardless of his personal opinion, on any legislation that might be affected by his ruling. Some of us may differ with his ruling that the present cloture rule cannot be invoked to terminate debate upon a motion to consider legislation, but the rule that a pending measure is not subject to a pending measure, and therefore not subject to the present cloture rule stands and we are confronted by a condition and not a theory.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President—The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not recognize that the ruling of the distinguished Senator from Michigan was in accord with all the precedents, and that there was no precedent to the contrary.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I just stated that in my remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator indicated that he differed with the Senator from Michigan in his ruling.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I did not say I differed with him. I said that with his own lights, and with the precedents before him, I could not see how he could make any other ruling. I certainly did not mean to criticize the ruling. But I do say that should he have handed down the ruling, we have no effective cloture rule in the United States Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he is familiar with the statements made from time to time by Senators who were present when the cloture rule was adopted, which clearly demonstrate that they never intended that the rule should apply to a motion to take up a measure.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to that question, I am glad to tell the Senator—and I am referring to it a little later in my remarks—that while I cannot point it out, but my view is that those Senators did not contemplate the loopholes. If they had, they would have taken care of it in 1917.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator, then, if he has read the Congressional Record for November 19, 1919, wherein it is shown that Senator Underwood, who was present when the rule was adopted, stated, that it was a poor excuse for a rule because it did not apply to everything, and where Senator Hitchcock of Nebraska is reported to have made the statement that in his opinion the proposed cloture rule did not even apply to a motion to take up a measure before the Senate. In those two instances Senators who were present when the rule was adopted clearly indicated that they did not intend that it should apply to anything but substantive legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. My answer to the Senator from Georgia is that I think at some time I have read the complete Record. I know as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration I considered the matter, and we studied all the discussions we could find, and my positive statement is that, in view of the ruling of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], we have no effective cloture rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I understand the Senator to say that he believed the Vandenberg ruling to be correct?

Mr. WHERRY. I say that in light of the precedents I do not see how he could have made any other ruling. But in making that ruling, I should like to say to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Michigan, that he did set up a precedent, so that unless we change Rule XXII we have no effective cloture rule, and that is what we are debating here today. The question is not one of majority vote. I am as just as much for freedom as is any other Member of the Senate. The question is, do we want an effective cloture rule If we do, let us have one. If we do not, let us be honest. I think that is everything, because under the Vandenberg ruling, we have no effective cloture rule. That is the whole story in a nutshell.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator feel the same way about the Vandenberg ruling
Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I said that in the light of the precedents cited by the Senator from Michigan, and in the light of the observations he made on the subject, I could not see how he could do otherwise than decide as he did on the appeal. That does not mean that the Senator from Georgia or I agree with the President pro tempore's position as to whether the Senator from Michigan said when he made his decision that he would have liked very much to have the Senate decide the question; that he would rather have the Senate, as it is now, than have the President pro tempore decide it at that time. I shall come to that point later in my statement. I think the question was decided by President pro tempore, instead of placing the responsibility on the present occupant of the chair. I believe what we ought to do is to debate the question and vote on it, and if we want to amend the rule let the Senate vote to amend it, and let us have an interpretation of the rule by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator makes his point with much simplicity, even though he speaks with clarity, it is a little difficult to keep up with him. Did I understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that the sole issue before the Senate now is the question of the two-thirds cloture?

Mr. WHERRY. No. What I said was that the sole issue before the United States Senate this afternoon is: Do we want a cloture rule or do we not? The present cloture rule is ineffectual; made so by the precedents so thoroughly debated that the debate on the then pending question of the two-thirds vote will not be invoked because of the loopholes existing in the rule.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, Mr. President, I wish to continue.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well, if the Senator prefers not to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he does not think his statement is in error in saying that the Senator from Michigan was the father of this ruling? I thought the Senator from Michigan made it very clear that the ruling he had made on the two-thirds vote might have been different, but that he found himself bound by the rulings which had been made by distinguished Presiding Officers who had preceded him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I signed the petition of the Senators from Nebraska if he did not misunderstand me. The Senator from Nebraska, despite the powerful position he occupies, will not be in control of the Senate, or of any other vote than his own, whenever a majority cloture provision is offered. If such a rule is adopted by the Senate it would undoubtably be a gag. Although the Senator may be in favor of a two-thirds rule, if the measure comes before the Senate for the next time, the Senator could not guarantee, as he well knows, that an amendment to it is offered, an amendment providing for cloture by majority vote will not be offered in place of a two-thirds vote provision. The Senator from Georgia knows I cannot guarantee any such thing. But I think that the Members of the Senate are so sensible and so reasonable, as I shall expect to point out later on, that the Senators could close the two-thirds rule if they can close up the loopholes which now make the rule ineffective, and thereby give us a cloture rule which would be effective on vote of two-thirds of all the Senators.

There are those who believe in cloture by majority vote. Those who do have a perfect right so to believe. But there are those of us who believe in cloture by the two-thirds vote, and we have a perfect right to our belief. It does not make any difference whether one believes in vote by majority or by two-thirds. If we do not place an effective cloture rule on the Senate floor, we will not have a chance to invoke cloture anyway.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia is one of the finest men I know. He has always been very reasonable. But I do not think he was coming out of his way when he calls this a gag rule, and so forth, and so on. When the time comes when two-thirds of the Members of the Senate feel that a specific matter of legislation has been so thoroughly debated that the two-thirds are willing to terminate debate, I do not believe that if they vote the two-thirds vote, and we have a perfect action should be designated as a gag rule. I believe the Senator from Georgia is hurting his own case when he says it is a gag rule when those of us who believe in a cloture rule have placed such a rule on the Senate floor, after a thorough debate has been held on an issue, after an exhaustive and complete debate has been had, vote to adopt a rule. It is not gag rule. In other words, it would be placing something sensible into a rule which will permit a vote up or down on an issue, whereas if we continue as we are now going, it will mean merely action after sheer exhaustion of physical effort by reason of the existence of a filibuster.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he did not misunderstand me. The Senator from Nebraska, despite the powerful position he occupies, will not be in control of the Senate, or of any other vote than his own, whenever a majority cloture provision is offered. If such a rule is adopted by the Senate it would undoubt-
amendment in the nature of a gag rule would not be adopted. In my own view, a cloture could be adopted by such a rule without the minority ever having a chance to speak, because a cloture petition could be filed, a motion could be made to adjourn until 5 minutes before the time that the vote is to be had on the cloture, and then just a mere majority here, if they were so disposed, could wipe out and obliterately completely the opportunity of any Senator to rise up on the Senate floor and make a speech against a proposition.

Mr. WHERRY. I might answer that question by asking the Senator from Georgia a question, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, if I obtain unanimous consent not to lose the floor thereby, I should like to answer the question asked by the Senator from Georgia by asking one in return.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Georgia this question: Would the Senator be in favor of closing up the two loopholes of if I told him that a sure that a two-thirds-vote provision would stay in the measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be perfectly frank with the Senator from Nebraska and say no, because I think that the Senate of the United States is the last forum of free discussion on earth, the last citadel of individual rights, the last refuge of oppressed minorities, and that there should be a right here to discuss matters before cloture or a gag rule can be applied. In my opinion, these loopholes have never hurt in any way. The Senator cannot refer to any case wherein they have done harm.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska asked me a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska asked unanimous consent that he might answer me by asking me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent that I might be permitted to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent that I might be permitted to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not objecting.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator can cite hypothetical cases in which great injury might result from the rule. As a matter of fact, actual experience in the period since 1917, when this rule was adopted, reveals that, with the exception of one or two occasions, there has never been a time when a motion to amend the Journal was debated or when a motion to take up a bill was debated, when we did not eventually come to a vote on cloture. Therefore I submit that the experience of the Senate shows that a motion to take up a bill, or a motion to amend the Journal, when used as a device by the minority who wish to get their case before the body, has not been a matter of great importance in the proposed change in the rules, of which the Senator is a coauthor, the minority might be rendered absolutely helpless and prevented from being heard, because a motion might be made to take up a bill, a cloture petition might be filed, and then the majority leader might say, "I move that the Senate adjourn until day after tomorrow at 12:55," and we would be confronted with a vote on cloture without any Senator having had an opportunity to speak.

That is the reason why those who drafted this rule did not make it apply to anything except pending legislation before the Senate. They had some respect for the rights of the minority. They had some proper concept of the dignity of the Senate. They knew that free debate in the Senate is handed down to us by the founding fathers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator and ask him if he does not think he has taken sufficient time to answer the question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will subside if the Senator desires. I would not like to cause him to lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. He completely evades my question. The question is this: If the Senator were assured that the two-thirds vote would be preserved, would he be willing to amend rule XXII so as to close the loopholes? His answer was "No."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. He completely evades my question. The question is this: If the Senator were assured that the two-thirds vote would be preserved, would he be willing to amend rule XXII so as to close the loopholes? His answer was "No."

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator asked me one of those "Have you stopped beating your wife?" questions, and did not let me complete it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit in all sincerity and reasonableness that many of the reasons why we could not amend the rule to that effect are to be found in the rules themselves. The Senator from Georgia well knows that even though at times we have endeavored
to invoke cloture, the opponents used the device of a motion to amend the Journal, so that it was impossible to obtain a direct vote on the subject matter. The only thing that can be accomplished after a long filibuster is make arrangements to withdraw this or that, and then proceed with the work of the Senate.

If we close the loopholes and provide that cloture shall be made applicable to all motions for a motion to withdraw, then we shall have an opportunity to terminate debate after the question has been debated on the floor of the Senate, under the remainder of the rule, which provides for a vote on cloture on the second day after the filing of the petition, and that each Senator shall have an hour. Debate on the question may continue, and the minority is not cut off at all.

The only thing we seek to do is to close the two loopholes which now render the cloture rule, rule XXII, ineffective. I ask Senators to think it through and not be confused by the question of a majority vote or a two-thirds vote, or any other issue. Today we have no effective cloture rule.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the Senator’s answer to the question asked by the Senator from Nebraska, I would like to ask the Senator from Nebraska this question: The Senator is familiar, is he not, with the fact that there is a considerable body of opinion in the Senate to the effect that cloture does apply to a motion to take up a bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is ample justification for the Senate itself determining that rule XXII, adopted in 1917, was intended to mean that the Senate should have an effective cloture rule.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my position exactly. I have already stated it. I do not know what the Senator from Nebraska was in the Chamber at the time. I invited the attention of the Senate to what was intended in 1917.

I also stated that at the time the Senator from Michigan handed down his decision, there were Senators who felt that cloture should apply to a motion as well as to a pending measure. So strongly did I support that argument that the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Russel, handed down his decision. I told the Senators from Nebraska that the cloture rule, the cloture rule we now have in the rule book and with the precedents which have been established, a vote could not even be obtained on that proposed legislation, because advantage would be taken of those loopholes and a vote on such proposed legislation would never be reached.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to interrupt, let me say I do not agree; I do not think that measure is of the type of legislation which people feel so strongly about that they vote on it.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I thought the Senator from Arkansas was intensely interested in that measure. He asked for an illustration of what I have in mind, and I gave him one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am intensely interested in it. I think perhaps the greatest injury that has ever come to the country from this rule is the delay in the enactment of the oleomargarine legislation.

I think it is pertinent to have the Senator cite to those of us who are very deeply interested in his reasoning just what injuries have come to the country because of the rule, because I think we can cite some great benefits which have come from it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator’s own President has said the change must be made. The Senator as a matter of importance to the country. I do not know the President himself has said—just today, I believe—that unless something is done about the rule, because I think we can cite some great benefits which have come from it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, thechange must be made.

Mr. WHERRY. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, instances both pro and con can be cited.

One of the finest statements I ever heard was made by the late President Wilson 2 years ago, I believe, during the debate on the proposed FEPC legislation, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russel]. As I recall his words, he said: “Finally, all good sense tells us that the subject is not exhausted. I may not quote the Senator exactly, but that is an approximate quotation of what he said. In other words, he was pointing out that possibly it is a good thing to have some legislation held up by minorities.

You, Mr. President from Arkansas will agree with me, I am sure, that after legitimate debate is had and after the issue is joined and the various points at issue have been thoroughly discussed, then the proponents, even though they may be in the minority, have a right to have a vote taken. Some of the finest suggestions ever made have come from minorities in this Senate. I might mention here the statement made by the late Senator Overton, of Louisiana, relative to the provisions of the Constitution requiring two-thirds majorities.

By way of illustration, let me say that if the proposed oleomargarine legislation were before the Senate, I am sure the Senator from Arkansas would wish to have a vote taken on that measure, and not have it put aside because of some loophole in the rule. However, under the situation existing today, a vote could not even be obtained on that proposed legislation because of the lack of an effective cloture rule. Does not the Senator agree with me as to that?
to get that measure passed, because there was no effective cloture rule in the Senate. However, because he found another device by which he might arm the merchant ships, he did not have to rely upon the cloture rule to obtain this result. Later he succeeded in having the cloture rule made effective, this proposed step must be taken.

Let me say that if President Truman has any effective, strong program—and I think the Senator from Nebraska has—then I refuse to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska declines to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield for relevant questions; but then I refuse to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it seems to me that a state of national emergency as a condition precedent to the application of cloture would be virtually impossible to define in these days of crises and emergencies and pressures for world-affecting decisions.

Under those circumstances, every bill introduced would be labeled "For the National Emergency," who could define what a national-emergency bill would be; who could say exactly where the line should be drawn in that connection? I think it is not only impracticable but impossible for much of our legislation these days to be handled in such a way. Much of our legislation on foreign affairs these days comes under the heading of emergency to stop the threat of onrushing communism. Practically all of it can be said to relate to a national emergency.

It is my belief that should the day ever come—God forbid—when our national security is suddenly threatened by some gripping, all-powerful, and powerful force, the Senate would be seized with an unanswerable and the danger so obvious to all that no Senator, having sworn to uphold the Constitution, would ever resort to action that would amount, to my mind, to treason. That is my answer to that particular argument.

The Hayden-Wherry resolution amply and sufficiently would cover such a two-thirds of the Senate to close debate on a pending motion or any motion before the Senate of the United States. In other words, it would help, not hinder, if we did have a national emergency.

The right of Senator Wilson's so-called armed-merchant-ship resolution, which was brought up in the Senate only a few weeks before the adjournment of the Congress sine die. Senators who had bitterly opposed that resolution, and had joined in the filibuster, later voted for the cloture rule, and the support came from every section of the Nation.

The device of filibustering against a motion to consider is a recent development, a recent discovery.

The present cloture procedure running back through the years, say that prior to the discovery of the motion-to-consider loophole, it was not the practice to filibuster against a motion to consider a bill or any other measure. The principle that was applied after a bill or resolution was formally before the Senate. That was the procedure at that time.

And the Hayden-Wherry resolution would close the loophole permitting filibusters against motions to consider, and it would permit two-thirds of the Senators to adopt that proposal notwithstanding Rule III of the Standing Rules of the Senate which provides that a motion to amend
and that therefore all Senators could easily agree that the rule was not to be used in such a manner that one group or another could take advantage of it?

Mr. WHERRY. If I am correct as to its history, it was probably in the interest of the national emergency, or growing out of it, that the cloture rule finally was adopted.

That is, it started in 1916, but it culminated in 1917, as the Senator knows. I am interested to agree with the Senator on his premise that we should not change a rule merely for the sake of making it possible to pass one particular piece of legislation; and I am not trying to do that. I am advocating a permanent cloture rule which will be effective, no matter what legislation may come before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know there are in this country very powerful groups who would like to have this rule changed for the express purpose of making possible the passage of substantive legislation, obtaining to themselves an advantage thereby?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I suppose that is true. I may say to the Senator I am glad he is present because the responsibility is going to be upon his shoulders. I like his approach, and I appreciate the Senator's feeling that the problems have been well established beyond anyone's reasonable doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. I think, directly to the contrary, it will work fairly to the advantage of all Senators—a rule of the same applicable every minute, every hour, every day, as we debate matters on the Senate floor. That is all I am asking.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator not realize that such a rule as he proposes would in effect play right into the hands of pressure groups, by enabling them to force a majority vote on any measure in which they might be interested?

Mr. WHERRY. I think, directly to the contrary, it will work fairly to the advantage of all Senators—a rule of the same applicable every minute, every hour, every day, as we debate matters on the Senate floor. That is all I am asking.

Mr. WHERRY. I think, directly to the contrary, it will work fairly to the advantage of all Senators—a rule of the same applicable every minute, every hour, every day, as we debate matters on the Senate floor. That is all I am asking.

Mr. WHERRY. I think, directly to the contrary, it will work fairly to the advantage of all Senators—a rule of the same applicable every minute, every hour, every day, as we debate matters on the Senate floor. That is all I am asking.
was not whittling away, little by little, our freedoms, which some people con-
tend will happen if the rule be adopted.
I think it was not.

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

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator realize that 2 years after rule XXII was changed it was called to the attention of the Sena-
tate, in regard to a treaty before the Sena-
tate, that the rule did not apply except to the pending measure before the Sena-
tate?

Mr. WHERRY. To the pending measure before the Sena-
tate?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator is going to proceed on that line, I shall not yield.

Mr. LONG. Then it is going to be for the good of both parties.

Mr. WHERRY. If I did not so believe I should never have voted in favor of the rule, in my opinion it is good in the interests of the East, West, North, and South.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. President, I want to discuss what I believe to be the vital importance of adopting the pending motion by the senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] for direct action upon the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I believe that the question of perfecting rule XXII so that it will be effective in carrying out the pur-
pose for which it was originally intended, is of great im-
portance to the Senate, to our country, and to the world.

We live in fateful, crucial times. The problems that confront us are of trem-
endous importance to us and to our children. The course that we take as a Senate on many matters that are clamor-
ing for our determination depends very largely upon the action of some very smart Members of the Senate since that time.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I am not fill-
boring.

Mr. LONG. Does it occur to the Sena-
tor that those Senators voted for the change in the rule because of the im-
minence of war at that time, and pos-
sibly, except for that fact, they would not have voted for it?

Mr. WHERRY. That is another inter-
pretation which the Senator can make if he wishes. But that is merely an in-
stance of why they changed the rule, just as the legislation now before us makes it important to change it.

What is it the rule says?

Mr. WHERRY. The rule says that the Senate has stated that the Senate now has before it legis-
lation which makes a change of the rules imperative.

Mr. WHERRY. No. The Senator mis-
understands me. I said that when changes are suggested to the rules they are usually occasioned by legislation.

Mr. LONG. Did not the Senator say the legislation before the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think I said
that. But that is all right; I will accept the amendment. Much of the legisla-
tion provided by Mr. Truman will have to have the cloture rule applied, or it will not be passed, judging from what the President is reported in the press to have said that morning.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I refuse to yield furt
her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator is going to proceed on that line, I shall not yield.

Mr. President, the rule is for the good of both parties.

Mr. WHERRY. If I did not so believe I should never have voted in favor of the rule, in my opinion it is good in the interests of the East, West, North, and South.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I refuse to yield furthere.

Mr. President, I want to discuss what I believe to be the vital importance of adopting the pending motion by the senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] for direct action upon the Hayden-Wherry resolution. I believe that the question of perfecting rule XXII so that it will be effective in carrying out the pur-
pose for which it was originally intended, is of great im-
portance to the Senate, to our country, and to the world.

We live in fateful, crucial times. The problems that confront us are of trem-
endous importance to us and to our children. The course that we take as a Senate on many matters that are clamor-
ing for our determination depends very largely upon the action of some very smart Members of the Senate since that time.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I am not fill-
boring.

Mr. LONG. Does it occur to the Sena-
tor that those Senators voted for the change in the rule because of the im-
minence of war at that time, and pos-
sibly, except for that fact, they would not have voted for it?

Mr. WHERRY. That is another inter-
pretation which the Senator can make if he wishes. But that is merely an in-
stance of why they changed the rule, just as the legislation now before us makes it important to change it.

What is it the rule says?

Mr. WHERRY. The rule says that the Senate has stated that the Senate now has before it legis-
lation which makes a change of the rules imperative.

Mr. WHERRY. No. The Senator mis-
understands me. I said that when changes are suggested to the rules they are usually occasioned by legislation.

Mr. LONG. Did not the Senator say the legislation before the Senate?
Mr. WHERRY. Thus it will be noted, Mr. President, that the principle of majority rule is not absolute.

The stipulation requiring two-thirds majorities in these various matters obviously was made doubly sure that far-reaching actions would not be taken by the Senate without the most careful weighing of their consequences. This is an aspect of the great design of checks and balances in the Republican Government. The suggestion is made that since a simple majority is all that is required to declare war, the most fateful action that can be foreseen in a war of grave consequence, matters being of less gravity certainly can be decided by a majority vote of the Senate. I have heard that argument many times.

With that line of reasoning I disagree. My disagreement is based upon the glorious record of our country when the issue of war has been presented to the Congress. Of the filibuster club whose votes against the declaration of war in the Second World War and in the First World War only six Senators voted against the declaration that a state of war existed, and none of the Senators did filibuster.

Declaration of war can be safely left to a majority, because we know that the American people always have been extremely patient and considerate and disposed of invoking every possible alternative to war before they have resolved there was no other way left than resort to arms in defense of our country.

In fact, the two-thirds principle is woven through our Congressional procedure on so many vital, far-reaching matters that no one, I believe, is suggesting in this body that the two-thirds principle be abolished in the instances cited by the late Senator Ovorten, which have now been printed in the Record, as I requested a moment ago.

So, Mr. President, we are today confronted with conflicting opinions on what should be done. Some philosopher has observed that perfection is a combination of defects and beauty. If we look to that philosophy, I believe, is suggesting in this body that the two-thirds principle be abolished in the instances cited by the late Senator Ovorten, which have now been printed in the Record, as I requested a moment ago.

Mr. WHERRY. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I shall yield, if that is satisfactory to the Senator.

The question before the Senate today should be decided in the affirmative before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of any other matter save, of course, such emergency matters as can be quickly disposed of and not serve to perpetuate the present void in our rules of procedure.

Since my party is temporarily in the minority in this body I could take the position of holding up procedure to preserve the present chaotic situation, in which a few men can tie Senate procedure into knots. That could be a useful opportunity were I so blind to my duty and responsibility not only of my State of Nebraska but, in a sense, the whole Nation.

I am trying to be objective, and view the matter of cloture as a permanent Senate fixture that shall be available down through the years and be available for whatever situation may arise—situations that now only can be imagined. That is my purpose in joining in offering a new rule.

It seems to me that our guiding purpose should be to see that we have rules of procedure that facilitate the consideration of matters that are properly brought before us—to consider rules for sensible and fair expedition in the disposition of those matters. It has only been said that great issues are usually decided by compromise and that none of us has his own way completely on any far-reaching legislation. We must give a little in order to preserve the road of peace. It has been my purpose, as a Senator and servant of the people, to adhere to what I believe to be principles, and I shall endeavor never to compromise so as to violate those principles.

If I could speak at considerable length upon the possibility that our present Vice President, the President of the Senate, whom we all respect most highly, is eager and willing to reverse the ruling made by the President pro tempore of the Senate on August 2, 1948, I do not say he is; I say I could speak at more length of the possibility. That ruling was made by the Vice President when he was majority leader of the Senate that he did not agree with the President pro tempore on August 2, 1948. However, I see no profit in speculating on what the present President of the Senate will do, if he or the majority leader would be disposed to him for official action. The Rules and Administration Committee in reporting the Hayden-Wherry resolution has accepted the fact as it stands today. Adoption of Senate Resolution 15 is imperative if standing rule XXII is to be an effective instrument against rule by a small minority.

I am hopeful that Senators, all of us, will agree that the merit of Senate Resolution 15 to enable our Senate to function, and to act upon the many problems that are confronting us, will heavily outweigh all other considerations.

Let us debate the Hayden-Wherry resolution. Let us hear the arguments. And then let us vote. That is the American, that is the Republican way.

Matters of tremendous importance are crowding the Senate stage. We should be free to dispose of them and not be gagged and tied by any small minority. The question before the Senate at this moment transcends all others. It should be answered by the people and not by rules and nays in order that the way may be paved for free consideration of important matters that are in the offing.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall oppose any attempt to sidetrack this paramount issue of cloture, except for some contingency that requires swift action. Let us get a vote on what is before the Senate.

I disagree with the reported policy of the majority leader (Mr. Lucas) to treat this vital cloture as a stepchild, to be put on and off the Senate stage, as time rushes by and the flood of appropriation bills and other measures to keep the Government going pours in upon us. In that I humbly disagree with the distinguished majority leader, whom I highly respect, if what I have read as a statement by him was correct.

If I read the report correctly, I got that impression. I want the distinguished majority leader, whom we all respect, to know that, so far as I am concerned, I think we should debate the pending question, and, after it is fully debated, we should have a vote on it, and that it should not be sidetracked by anything, unless a dire emergency should arise which would make that necessary.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I am glad to yield to the majority leader. I have refused to yield to the Senators before concluding my statement, but I will yield to the Senator from Illinois, because I think the point now being made is an important one.
Mr. LUCAS. The Senator’s statement is partially correct and partially incorrect. There was a statement given out by the majority leader with reference to the vote in the future of the minority to set aside the cloture amendment in order to act upon vitally important matters. I had in mind those matters concerning which there is a deadline when existing legislation expires. But insofar as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that we are going to stay here from now on until we get a disposition of this rule. And it is going to be a successful disposition, in my judgment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, for his observation. I might not have interpreted correctly all of his statement, but whether I did or did not is beside the point. We now have the positive statement made by the majority leader that except for some dire emergency requiring legislation, or legislation necessary to be enacted by reason of the approach of a deadline, or something of that kind, I will proceed with this debate until it is concluded, and I want to compliment the Senator from Illinois in advocating such procedure.

Mr. President, there is a difference between the resolutions that have been presented to the Rules and Administration Committee from time to time, attempting to close up the two loopholes which made rule XXII inoperative. I am speaking about the Knowland resolution, the Saltonstall resolution, the Ives resolution, the Myers resolution, and other resolutions. The resolutions that were considered by the Rules and Administration Committee in 1946 and in 1947 all contained not only the attempt to close up the loopholes but in addition required that the two-thirds vote be reduced to a majority vote.

And it is my feeling that those who introduced the resolutions were just as anxious then as they are now to reduce the two-thirds vote to a majority vote as they were to close up the loopholes. Their resolutions were over-all, inclusive, and attempted to make rule XXII operative by not only closing the loopholes but also they desired to reduce the vote on a cloture petition to end debate on a majority vote.

Therefore, the difference between what is up for consideration this morning and what has been introduced to resolutions that have been considered by the Rules and Administration Committee in the past slimmers down to this one point in my mind. It is that the Senator and the Senate would wish to restate it, and I hope the Senate will not get away from this one issue.

Does the Senate want an effective cloture rule or does it not? Is it not and who is the person to whom the vote shall be reduced to a majority. It is simply this one issue. Does the Senate want an effective cloture rule? And I say that because of Senator Vandenberg found in the Congressional Record, August 2, 1948, at page 9002, sums up all the precedents, reasoning, and discussion relative to accomplishing this result and decide now whether or not it wants an effective cloture rule. That can be decided here by a vote and by debate. If two-thirds of the Senate feel it should have such a rule, it should be adopted. If two-thirds feel it should not be a rule, we should wipe rule 22 off the books and proceed without any cloture rule at all.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Connecticut, Frank B. Brandegee, raised a very interesting point in connection with cloture, and I quote from him briefly—

So I say that this—

Meaning the Senate—

is the forum of the States. This is a federated government, in which the States retain all the rights that they have in the United States Senate, and that the only provision of the Constitution which never should be subject to amendment.

And that clause of article V does in fact provide that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. I now ask the Senator from Nebraska, what is the answer to the question: Does the present cloture rule deny the States the equal right of suffrage in the Senate? Is there any way that it impedes upon that right?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that I do not think it does. Cloture has been invoked four times. In the times it was successfully invoked, if I remember correctly, the smallest number of Senators voting was 86, and the greatest number of Senators voting was 94. I believe when a vote was taken on the question cloture was invoked seven times. On four of those seven occasions the number of Senators voting was from 70 to 82. On the other three occasions the number was slightly greater. I believe every State of the Union was represented by Senators who voted on the question of cloture, when that question came to a vote. Each State was represented in the vote. Therefore I contend that the people of all the States were represented in such votes.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say that I am very sympathetic with, tremendously interested in, and deeply favor, the proposed change in the rule. But is it fair to say that this particular change in the rules applies equally to all the States?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. So it does not deprive one State or another of the same opportunity on the floor of the Senate. Every State is subject to the same rule.

Mr. President, I yield. 
Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator a question relating to the point which was raised earlier regarding the possibility that either the present Presiding Officer or a future Presiding Officer might reverse the precedents of the Senate. It is not the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska that even if a subsequent ruling should reverse the prior precedents of the Senate, it would still be desirable to amend the rules and close the debate.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator. That is one of the things for which I have been pleading. Ninety-six Senators ought to make the rules. I am not saying that the Presiding Officer might not be just as forceful. However, instead of having a difficult situation, with the decision to be made by the Presiding Officer, the Senate itself should make the rules.

I do not know how the Senator from Michigan felt about the appeal from his decision, but I got the impression from what he said when he made his decision that he would like to have the Senate vote on the question, rather than be obliged to make the decision himself, for the very reason which the Senator from California has suggested. We are the ones who should make the rules.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, around the world America stands today as the last sanctuary of human decency and freedom. It must be obvious to all Americans who read or hear the threats which spring from the forces of tyranny and degradation as a free and sovereign people.

It is because we have always been jealous to defend and protect our magnificent American traditions and those Christian principles of decency, justice, and human liberty in which our American traditions are rooted.

Therefore during the recent anniversary of the great statesman, soldier, and patriot, our first American President, we have acted wisely in recalling once more the profound wisdom which arises ever new in each succeeding generation from Washington's magnificent Farewell Address.

There is one particular admonition contained therein to which I want to call the attention of my colleagues during these dangerous and trying days. This warning, which runs throughout George Washington's final counseling with his fellow countrymen, is pointed out in the following words:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.

But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it.

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of mischief.

Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to be become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the animosities and confidence of the people to surrender their interest.

In keeping with the spirit of this magnificent advice I want to present a very brief account of exactly what has been happening for the past 3½ years following the end of the war, because this administration has forsaken George Washington's counsel.

I refer to the outrageous Morgenthau plan, which calls for the destruction of the German industrial machine, as such, in Europe, a plan which is still the basic policy of this Government, a plan which continues to operate because the vicious and perverted minds of the hate artists in this country have suppressed the real truth and immediately attack anyone who demands that America repudiate this policy of vengeance—a plan which plays directly into the hands of the Communists all over the world, a plan which betrays American interests and principles—indeed, our whole Christian heritage—and a plan which, while it is pretended to be a great boon and blessing, actually impoverishes and exploits our country, for the benefit of others who seek to destroy us.

Mr. President, I hope that every Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle who is now advocating the continuation of the Marshall plan and the giving away of more billions of the taxpayers' money will carefully consider the two succeeding pages.

As conclusive proof of the impartial basis of fact upon which these charges are founded, I submit a statistical objective analysis of the way in which we, the American people, are being exploited to further the destruction of our own vital interests, by those who claim to be serving our interests and strengthening our security by following this senseless policy of destruction.

Mr. President, what would George Washington himself think of the following picture of how we are being betrayed, which shows the direct consequences on the economy of Europe of the deliberate American policy of destroying German industry?

These facts, while they deal with Italy and Denmark exclusively, give a grim picture of how the other European countries are also directly affected.

Mr. President, the following facts indicate that the value of the food lost to Germany from Italy, and manufactured articles lost to Italy, as a result of our policy of destroying German industrial plants, is costing American taxpayers an estimated $100,000,000 a year.

In 1938 Germany exported to Italy $20,000,000 worth of foodstuffs. Of this, Germany's share was valued at $50,000,000. That total amount, if replaced in the United States, is equal to a minimum of $100,000,000. I ask any Senator who voted for the Marshall plan what is Germany supplying Italy today under the military government regime? For the first 3 months of 1948, total exports from bizonal Germany to Italy, almost entirely coal, amounted to only $12,867,000. For 12 months that would be some $20,000,000, and one might add another $5,000,000 in order to compare it properly with prewar Germany. Thus, total exports are running at the rate of about $25,000,000 a year, against a volume for 1938 equal to over a hundred million dollars just for manufactured articles alone.

Mr. President, what is Germany supplying Italy today?—a volume about $2,000,000, represents Italy's deficit in manufactured goods due solely to the destruction of the German industrial machine. The threats to Italy's standard of living and its political repercussions were largely responsible for the Marshall plan.

Moreover, Italy gets $32,400,000 worth of coal from the dwindling coal supplies of the United States of America. How does this allocation fit into this picture? The total industrial machinery replaces German exports may be shown even in individual items. Under ECA, $1,700,000 is allocated for agricultural machinery, as against $860,000 supplied by Germany in 1936. Similarly, under ECA, $7,000,000 is allocated, as against Germany's $5,336,000. In chemicals, under ECA, $10,000,000 is given, as against Germany's $7,900,000.

But, Mr. President, at the same time we are furnishing Italy the means to increase her production we are engaged in ruining her best customer for the surplus of manufactured goods. Eighty percent of the food furnished Germany by Italy—more than 300,000 tons—was made up of perishable fruits and vegetables. When these seasonal perishables are available for export—oranges, tangerines, lemons, and so forth—the domestic consumption has already reached the saturation point, beyond which the people will not, and cannot, eat. People cannot live solely on oranges or cauliflower. Unless the surplus can be exported, it largely becomes sheer waste.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer inform us what is the calorie intake of the German population at the present time?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me what the calorie intake of the German population is at the present time?
Mr. LANGER. It is less than 2,000 calories.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is there any starvation in Germany at the present time? There is, especially in the part which contains the so-called Sudetenland, and also among the 15,000,-

000 expellees who came from the neigh-

boring countries when Stalin entered them. The result was that 15,000,000 of those persons went into the American, British, and French zones of western Germany. Some 5,000,000 of those per-

sons are dead. The remaining 10,000,-

000, the reports show, are in a starving condition.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why was it that the Displaced Persons Commission did not approve the entry of some of those persons into the United States, provided under the Displaced Persons Act which the Congress passed last year?

Mr. LANGER. I had quite a consulta-

tion with Mr. Carusi and Mr. O'Connor, of the Dis-

placed Persons Commission. They maintain that under section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act they have jurisdic-

tion whatsoever so far as expellees from the United States are concerned; they maintain that that is entirely a matter for the Department of State.

I took up the question with the Department of State, and I quoted some letters written by some of the Depart-

ment's legal counsel. Their legal staff had written that under the IRO constit-

ution, persons from the Sudetenland are not included. However, the Depart-

ment of State later wrote me a letter stating that those persons are included. But at the present time, very few, if any, of those persons have come to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am interested in the Senator's statement relative to the Displaced Persons Commission's saying that such persons are not eligible to enter the United States under that act.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did not the Sena-

tor's amendment provide that they should be admitted to this country under that act?

Mr. LANGER. I certainly thought that section 12 of the act permitted them to enter, because I used the same lan-

guage which was used in the IRO Consti-

itution—namely, "Germans of ethnic origin." Frankly, I cannot agree at all with the Department of State, which has been excluding them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator kindly tell me the reasons the State De-

partment had and the reasons Mr. Carusi had for taking that position?

Mr. LANGER. The State Department maintained that he was entirely helpless, and that under section 12 the State Depart-

ment was directed to take care of the ex-

pellees. On the other hand, the State Department gave the reason that there is no legal definition of "Germans of ethnic origin."

Mr. EASTLAND. He could not read the English language; is that the case?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know whether he could read the English language or not, but that is the excuse they gave.

Mr. EASTLAND. Do I correctly un-

derstand from the Senator that no per-

sons of German ethnic origin who were expelled from areas now behind the Iron Curtain have been admitted to this coun-

try under any of the laws through Congress authorized their admission?

Mr. LANGER. Very few, if any, have been admitted.

Mr. EASTLAND. If I correctly un-

derstand the Senator—if he will yield for another question—

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understand that even though the United States Congress ordered it, Mr. Carusi and certain officials of the State Department have re-

fused to carry out the mandates of that act.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct, except that Mr. Carusi claims he has no jurisdiction, and that the matter is one for the State Department to handle, and that he and the other two members of the Displaced Persons Commission are helpless.

At the present time the Department of State is looking around for a defense.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it the Senator's opinion that the will of Congress is being flouted by Mr. Carusi?

Mr. LANGER. Not by Mr. Carusi, but by the Department of State, because section 12 directs that 12,000,000 of those persons immediately be brought to this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me the population of the three western zones of Germany before the war?

Mr. LANGER. About 80,000,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is, of all Germans?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. Later that was increased somewhat; but in the Amer-

ican and British zones the popula-

tion is larger by some 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 than it was before the war.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not 12,000,000?

Mr. LANGER. It is at least 12,000,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. The 12,000,000 figure in-

cludes the population of the French zone.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me whether the three western zones of Germany before the war produced about 80 percent of their food require-

ments?

Mr. LANGER. They produced 80 per-

cent.

Mr. EASTLAND. That was the case for all of Germany?

Mr. LANGER. No; the three western zones of Germany produced 80 percent of all the food that Germany produced.

Mr. EASTLAND. Today, with five or six million more persons, as the Senator has said—or, in reality, I think the records will show that there are 12,000,000 more persons there—and with a tremen-

dous shortage of fertilizer, and with the land being depleted of humus matter and plant food, can the Senator tell me what percentage of their food requirements those persons are able to produce at this time?

Mr. LANGER. I regret that I cannot do so, but I know it is much lower than it was before the war.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator realizes that Germany is primarily an industrial nation, and must export industrial mate-

rials, and must use the funds thus ob-

tained to buy food or the basis of dollar exchange or sterling exchange or whatever may be the monetary unit applying to the funds thus received for the in-

dustrial goods manufactured in Germany. Will the Senator state the postwar standard of living of the people if they are held to the industrial level of 1936, when at this time there are living there several million more people than lived there before the war?

Mr. LANGER. There could be only one result if that situation continues, and that is starvation and more suffer-

ing.

Mr. EASTLAND. The effect would be to starve the people.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the German peo-

ple should embrace communism, does not the Senator believe that if Germany were Communist all Europe would go Communist?

Mr. LANGER. There is not the least doubt of it in my mind.

Mr. EASTLAND. In fact, is it not the Senator's opinion that the battle for Germany is the battle for the European continent?

Mr. LANGER. I think that is stated exactly right.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it the Senator's opinion France could defend herself?

Mr. LANGER. France could not de-

fend herself, in the opinion of the mili-

tary experts with whom I have discussed the matter.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Europe were Communist, the United States in the light of those reasonably may happen on the Asiatic continent, would be isolated, would she not?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then the only question we would have would be to fight: is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Sena-

tor think the policy of holding a great people to the industrial level of 1936, when their standard of living was not so
hight, at a time when there were millions more mouths to feed, is brutal and inhuman?

Mr. LANGER. I agree that that is true, and I do not think words are strong enough to express it.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that American blood at some time must pay for blunders in our foreign policy at the present time?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi is through?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to correct what the Senator has said, as it seems I misunderstood him. The Senator has said the State Department and the Immigration Department are not living up to the terms of the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that in the immigration report, Mr. Carus, the Displaced Persons Commissioner, said the terms of the act make it practically impossible to carry it out?

Mr. LANGER. No. The Commission said they had nothing to do with section 12, referring to the so-called expellees, that was solely a matter within the jurisdiction of the State Department.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the feeling is that the law must be amended, in order that we may really bring in the people we want to bring in under the terms of the act.

Mr. LANGER. If we are to bring in more than the 13,500 expellees, that would simply be necessary.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator please explain how it would be possible to express a thought clearer in the English language than the Senator expressed it in section 12 when we authorized the admission of expellees to this country?

Mr. LANGER. In my opinion, the language could not be more explicit.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I could not bear what the Senator said. Will he kindly repeat it?

Mr. LANGER. In section 12 the Department of State is directed immediately to open the quotas to Germany and Austria which would be $2,000 a year, and it was further directed immediately to make one-half of those available to the so-called Volksdeutsche, or expellees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But only under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act; am I not correct in that?

Mr. LANGER. It amended the immigration law.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator said "under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act." What are those terms? I do not understand.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the person to be admitted must be assured a home, he must have an occupation, and that is all.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator did not understand those terms to apply to expellees; did he?

Mr. LANGER. They do not apply.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not understand they do not apply.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator should have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts, for so long as he is involved, we southerners will not be accused of engaging in a filibuster. If I understand the Senator correctly, Mr. Carus took the position that the Displaced Persons Commission has nothing to do with the admittance of expellees. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. He takes the position they should receive a visa from the State Department in the regular course; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. President, the threat to Italy's standard of living and its political repercussions were largely responsible for the Marshall plan, under which in the first years' allocation ECA is giving Italy industrial goods worth $59,300,000, made in America, in place of what she formerly bought and paid for. That is, Italy used to pay Germany the $59,300,000. Now, instead of doing that, the taxpayers of the United States pay the $59,300,000, which our factories get $82,400,000 worth of coal from our dwindling coal supplies.

How closely this allocation of industrial machinery replaces Germany's exports may be shown in individual items. Under ECA $1,750,000 is allocated for agricultural machinery against Germany's $5,336,000, for chemicals against Germany's $10,000,000 against Germany's $7,800,- 000.

But at the same time that we are furnishing Italy the means to increase her production, we are engaged in ruining her best customer for this surplus, Germany. Eighty percent of the food furnished Germany by Italy, more than 300,000 tons of perishable fruits and vegetables. When these seasonal perishables are available for export, oranges, tangerines, lemons, vegetables, and so forth, then the production has already reached a saturation point, beyond which people cannot and will not eat. People cannot live solely on oranges or cauliflower. Unless this surplus can be exported it becomes largely sheer waste.

A surplus fruit and vegetable region in north Africa, strikingly similar to Italy, faced with the loss of exports, has reduced its production drastically, changing, in one season, from a terri
tory such that thousands of tons of produce, into a region not raising enough vegetables even for local consumption.

On the other hand, no such control can be exercised over fruits such as oranges.

In Italy and Sicily oranges were going begging in 1944 because the central European countries were cut off. We face another condition in Germany out of the market in large measure. Such a situation permits England to buy the Sicilian orange and lemon crop for prices ruinous to the producers, principally because German demand is cut off. So when we keep Germany down we are injuring much of the rural economy of Italy and creating the very dissatisfaction which the Marshall plan set out to correct.

All these things hold true of a country like Denmark, on the other side of the Continent. In 1936 Germany imported from Denmark food worth $432,000,000, and today at least $85,000,000. Under the military government administration of western Germany all imports from Denmark, not only food, are running at the rate of only $8,000,000 annually. That deficit of more than $80,000,000 is made up by the United States, or in a reduced German diet resulting from purchasing reduced rations. To make myself clear, let me say that before we entered upon this program Denmark sent to Germany $85,000,000 worth of food. Today she sends only $3,000,000 worth, and the American taxpayer is paying the difference.

But this is the other half of the picture. German exports merely of manufactured goods were valued at $51,000,000, which in today's values would be some $100,000,000. What is bizonia doing now under military government? For the first 8 months of 1945 total exports were valued in excess including coal, $814,000,000, of which for 1 year would be equivalent to about $10,000,000. Subtracting the value of the coal, it leaves $3,000,000. Today, it is compared with the figures for the whole of Germany, we might add about 30 percent to this figure, arriving at an outside figure of $15,000,000, leaving $85,000,000 as Denmark's deficit in manufactured goods, which she formerly obtained from Germany.

Again ECA has come to the rescue, allocating Denmark $47,800,000 of manufactured goods from America.

The critical stage is now and the Danish shortage in manufactured articles add up to a figure well over a hundred million dollars which America is asked to give as a bonus to those who have skillfully developed the industrial potential of Germany. This is merely to handle the deficit in the interchange between Germany and a little country like Denmark.

Of course, production in Denmark follows the usual economic laws and declines. It gives Great Britain a chance to buy more. But this itself presents a critical problem for farmers. In the year 1937, for example, Germany
imported 306,503 tons of food from Denmark against 357,113 tons imported by Britain. The loss of this huge German market has a serious effect on farmer's prices and consequently on Danish food producers. The farmers have only one answer to this—reduce production. And again the United States makes up the difference, not only for Germany but for many other European countries.

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

Mr. LANGER. I should like to finish my statement, first. Then I shall be glad to yield.

On the other hand, Danish business­men point out that now they have to pay more for everything that goes into production. England's prices, even before the Marshall plan, are only higher. Now with her principal competitor gone, she can charge all that the market will stand. So Denmark is getting the short end two ways. She has to pay higher prices and even then is not able to get the manufactured articles that she needs.

For more than 3 years now, leading European economists, studying the situation in Germany, have been pointing out that the destruction of Germany's production would drastically reduce the standard of living of most of the European people. She is proving they are right when we appropriate the ECA billions as a gift to a Europe whose reduced living standards invite communism.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator spoke of the way Germany and Denmark have been affected. Does the Senator realize how the United States has also been affected?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator realize that our own country has sold more farm products to Germany than we have sold to Latin America of both industrial and agricultural products combined?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. And it is very necessary that we have greater production and economy on American farms. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. LANGER. There can be no doubt about that.

These facts have covered only two countries. Between Denmark and Germany they are presenting a bill, just for 1 year, of $200,000,000. It is an outrageous penalty that we are paying for the privilege of seeing Germany and the German peaceetime production potential reduced to its present state.

By pushing coal exports and drastically reducing the export of manufactured articles we are multiplying Germany's foremost problem of getting foreign exchange to meet her dire need for food and raw materials. If we compare these figures with those from the present Senator from Mississippi, interested as he is in agricultrue, will listen carefully to this, and I hope that every other Senator upon the floor, and those who are in favor of the Marshall plan, will also listen carefully.

In 1936 a ton of manufactured articles shipped to Italy averaged $119 a ton compared with $3.70 for a ton of coal. Germany obtained from Italy 32 times as many goods as were shipped as a ton of coal. On exports to Denmark she got 34 times as much.

But this is nothing to many of the great export items for which Germany was famous. German skilled craftsmen took coal, worth for export to Denmark only $3.58 per ton, and iron plates worth $88 a ton, and, out of these materials, made machine tools for Den­mark worth $818 a ton, electrical ma­chinery worth $1,439, precision and optical instruments worth $3,608, hardware worth $245 a ton, and watches and clocks with $137 a ton.

In 1938, of these five items alone, she exported to Denmark 17,578 tons worth $8,167,800, with which she bought her raw materials. The same amount of coal would have given her $64,100, not even one-hundredth as much.

This same thing is going on with all countries from which Germany got her food supply. These same five items which were exported to Italy in 1936, bought food worth $14,568,000. The same number of tons of coal brought $122,751, again less than a hundredth as much. These items would have paid for 200,000 tons of food. The coal would have paid for less than 2,000.

Mr. President, these facts alone are sufficient to prove the economic insanity that underlies our outrageous policy toward these defeated peoples. There is no quicker way in the world to foster a cancer in the heart of Europe than to continue to ignore the desperate need for a complete about-face in our German policy.

Not only is this economic insanity under­mining the political structure of central Europe, not only is it contributing directly to permanent unemployment and unrest, but it is also playing directly into the hands of the Communists who are demanding the return of the United States from the Follitburo in Moscow.

The following figures ought to be sufficient to silence those who continue to demand that we go through with this savage, senseless policy because we have made agreements which must be honored. These agreements, Mr. President, which we are being moved from the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States, now amount to nothing less than a criminal betrayal of our national security, a criminal betrayal which borders on treason.

Oh, how I wish, Mr. President, that every GI, every veteran, could know those figures and realize how America has been betrayed.

Recent figures released by the British themselves in Berlin reveal that of the 586,000 tons of machinery and other equipment destroyed by the B-29s in the British zone, 162,896 tons have been shipped to Russia, 18,618 tons have been shipped to Czechoslovakia, 45,135 tons have been shipped to Yugoslavia, and 2,798 tons have been shipped to Albania.

Oh, yes; our Department of State is furnishing Russia, but the Secretary sat in the Committee on Foreign Relations without lifting his voice and said that 162,896 tons have been shipped to Russia! Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. LANGER. Let me complete this thought, and then I shall be glad to yield. But, Mr. Special Report to the London Times on December 20, 1946, it was revealed that the British are still dismantling and shipping to Russia the Borbeck plant of the Krupp steel works.

The report in the Times reads as fol­lows:

The Borbeck plant was the most modern steel plant in Europe. It started produc­tion in May 1929. In 1945 it was awarded to the Soviet Union. Under the direction of a Russian commission, the plant in Essen for that purpose, the dismantling was accomplished at the greatest speed by 10,000 German workmen. The Berlin blockade and the differences getting between West and East Germany have in no way halted dismantling of this Krupp plant. It is reported that a goods freight train, loaded with parts of the plant, has left Essen in the direction of Hamburg, where the equipment was transferred on Russian ships. The destination in Russia is unknown. A further allocation of Krupp plants by the Interallied Reparations Agency has taken place in favor of Yugoslavia. This country will receive a 15,000-ton steel press, the largest in Europe, from Krupp.

I now yield to the Senator from Missis­ippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator have the figures about the dismantling in the French zone?

Mr. LANGER. I have them in my office, I do not have them here.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator be kind enough to place those figures in the Record?

Mr. LANGER. The following figures show what is going on in the French dis­mantlement program. According to the Allied allocations for the French zone, 94 plants were marked for dismantlement, of which 22 plants have been dismantled. These 22 plants have been sent to Russia. Of the 22, 4 have been sent to Russia, 58 have been delivered to the Interallied Reparations Agency and 22 await delivery to specific consignees.

The value of these plants has been de­termined at the figure of 150 to $200 mil­lions. This figure was based on the 1938 replacement value, less war damage, and depreciation, which means that the actual value is at least 10 times as great as the figure that has been set by the French.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator understand that the French Government, in the French zone in Germany, are tak­ing title to business and industry?

Mr. LANGER. That is my under­standing.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator understand that the French Army sta­tioned there is consuming a large part of the food produced in the French zone?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that there is any justice in the
United States giving hundreds of millions of dollars, under a Marshall aid plan, to France or to any other country, and permitting that country, by unjust means, to beat down the people there, which in the long run will harm the United States?

Mr. LANGER. It is bound to harm the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think we should place strings on the Marshall plan aid which we give France, and make them follow a more humane policy in regard to their zone in Germany?

Mr. LANGER. It is my belief that the United States should be withholding money from any country pursuing that sort of policy over those they have conquered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, under Mr. Connally, is in the right position to go into those questions?

Mr. LANGER. I do. They should go into them very carefully, and I have not the least doubt they will, under the leadership of the able and distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], who is chairman of that committee.

On top of all of these facts, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate, of the American people, and particularly the American farmers, to what is happening to the agricultural resources of central Europe as a result of the criminal deforestation program that is being carried on both by the British and the French, supported by the American taxpayers’ dollars. It is a fact that Great Britain owns or controls 27 percent of the world’s forest reserves. Yet since the end of the war, this vicious deforestation program is making a mockery of all the claims that Germany can become a self-supporting agrarian people.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand five pictures of the tragic consequences which are following this deforestation program. I call the attention of my colleagues to the erosion in the Luneburger Heide in Germany, in the British zone, which is destroying the fertility of the soil upon which the German people are more absolutely dependent than ever before in their history.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. On how many acres have trees been cut too closely in Germany?

Mr. LANGER. I have the figures here, and in a moment will give the Senator the information.

The following figures reveal how far this deforestation program has gone when we realize that these figures are based on 100 as the base figure of the timber cutting program of 1936:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States zone</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British zone</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total basin</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The French zone</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. President, how could facts more conclusively prove that this senseless policy, this Morgenthau plan, this scorched-earth madness, this pro-Communist policy, which has for its principles and security, is the direct consequence of our having forsaken George Washington’s warning that foreign alien interests and influence are the greatest foes of republican government and that

Excessive parsimony for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and to completely neglect the arts of influence on the other.

And now, Mr. President, this senseless policy of destruction and vengeance has led us into an impasse where these outrageous facts finally are being recognized for what they are.

On February 17, 1949, Mr. Stewart Alsop revealed in the Washington Post that the question of what constitutes the real objectives of American policy in Germany has now become the most significant and crucial issue before us. Mr. Alsop further revealed that:

It is highly significant that at long last the United States government is now making a serious effort to find an agreed and intelligent answer.

An attempt is now being made to draft a whole series of agreed policy papers dealing with all aspects of American policy in Germany. The preliminary drafting is being done by a four-man committee, which is now quietly meeting two or three times a week in the State Department.

Chairman of this committee is George Kennan, brilliant chief of State Department planners. Richard M. Bissell, able deputy ECA Administrator speaks for the ECA, which has a vital interest in the German problem. Robert Blum, special assistant to Secretary of Defense Forrestal, represents Forrestal and the Defense Department. The Army and Gen. Lucius Clay, American commander in Germany, are represented by Assistant Secretary of War Tracy Voorhees, who may succeed Mr. Alsop as Under Secretary of War and chief Washington spokesman for Clay.

So the Senator will see that at long last the problem is being recognized, but the dismantling is still continuing.

In a letter to the President of the Senate from Mississippi, I refer to figures which I wish to call to his attention. It is my understanding that four-tenths of 1 percent of the world’s reserve is held by Germany, against 27 percent held by Great Britain. While I have not the figures as to the number of acres, roughly three-fourths of the deforestation area is now subject to erosion.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Which country is responsible for that, Great Britain or France?

Mr. LANGER. I blame America for it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why?

Mr. LANGER. I blame America, together with Great Britain and France, because the committee over there agreed to this policy.

Mr. EASTLAND. Which committee?

Mr. LANGER. The Interallied Committee on Reparations which has charge of all three zones.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think that the matter is of such grave importance that it should be investigated by the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. LANGER. Yes, I do; and I do not have the least doubt that the committee will investigate it. Governor La Follette has just returned from Germany. He was in New York last week and there addressed 150 of the leading men in New York City. I understand he is on his way to Washington, and intends to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee and to give that committee a full and complete report of what is going on in Germany.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What became of the timber that was cut from the land?

Mr. LANGER. Most of it was shipped out of the country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Shipped to other countries?

Mr. LANGER. Shipped to other countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was it done in order to use the proceeds to buy food for Germans?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know why the timber was shipped away. It was simply taken as dismantled plants have been taken.

Mr. EASTLAND. Am I to understand from the Senator that three-fourths of the forest lands are in the condition as shown by the pictures exhibited by the Senator?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator does not mean three-fourths of all the land in Germany?

Mr. LANGER. No. Germany has four-tenths of 1 percent in forest reserves, and of that three-fourths is as represented by the pictures.

These four men will not, of course, make Germany go independently. The policy papers they draft will be referred back to the organizations and individuals they represent, including German government. Moreover, each preliminary paper will be sifted through another higher committee. This committee consists of Secretary of State Acheson, as chairman; ECA Chief Paul Hoffman; and Secretary of War Boyall. If Acheson’s committee approves a paper, it will be referred in turn to the National Security Council and the President for final decision.

What I mean is simply that the period of improvising policy in Germany is coming to an end.

Mr. President, welcome as these new developments are to Germany, who is interested in decency and justice, it would be tragic indeed if the policies of the past, in the formulation of which the United States Senate has been ignored, should be continued. I believe the time has come when the Congress of the United States, rather than leaving the future to chance, as we have left the past, ought to stand up on its own feet and put an end once and for all to this senseless, outrageous policy of destroying not only the peacetime industrial potential
but the agricultural resources of the German-speaking peoples as well.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. Lucas to proceed to the discharge of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike to suggest the absence of a quorum, but if it is proposed that the Senate continue the present debate, I shall feel obliged to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atkin</th>
<th>Urs</th>
<th>Murray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Fenlon</td>
<td>Connally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>McCall</td>
<td>Ecton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td>Johnson, Tex</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricker</td>
<td>Johnson, S.C</td>
<td>O'Malley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>Kefauver</td>
<td>O'Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Kinn</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain</td>
<td>Kinnb</td>
<td>Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td>Kilgore</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connally</td>
<td>Kilgore</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordon</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td>Schoeppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnell</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
<td>Smith, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Longs</td>
<td>Smith, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Sparkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Mentz</td>
<td>Stennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>McCarth</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elendir</td>
<td>McFarland</td>
<td>Thomas, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnum</td>
<td>McGrath</td>
<td>Thye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbright</td>
<td>McEwan</td>
<td>Tobey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>McKellar</td>
<td>Tydings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette</td>
<td>Magnuson</td>
<td>Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Mangumon</td>
<td>Venable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendrickson</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Maybank</td>
<td>Wherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoey</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Millikin</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>Mors</td>
<td>Wilbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>Muns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know how long the majority leader wishes to hold the Senate in session tonight. I dislike to speak at this late hour, although I do not intend to discuss this, but I wish to address the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, I think this is a memorable debate. Of that I have not the slightest doubt. No one has the capacity to look very far into the future; but the issues here raised and the methods here adopted are bound to have repercussions hereafter. It is simply inevitable. Immediately the work of the Congress is slowed down, because it is impossible to attend committee hearings and to conclude committee hearings which are in their final stages, and also meet the demand to be present on the floor at all times. So, Mr. President, I am conscious of the fact that this is a memorable debate. No man can quite see at this time the results which may flow from it.

I wish to begin my address with a further statement made by the Attorney General of the United States, that if there were any doubt as to whether the ordinary rules of parliamentary procedure do not and should not apply in the Senate of the United States, I know that the Senate is a legislative body in part. I know that it must handle legislative matters which come from the House, or which originate here and go to the House. But the Senate is a distinct institution within itself, a continuing body, only one-third of the membership of the Senate being elected every 2 years. It is not a body which chooses. Its primary function is not legislation in the strict sense. Its primary and main function, indeed, in certain important matters, partsake of the nature of conference and negotiation between sovereign bodies.

Be it remembered, Mr. President, that the Federal Government did not create the States. On the contrary, the States created the Federal Government. They gave it a Constitution. But such power as has thus partially been given by the people under amendments to the Constitution, or certain powers which partake of the nature of legislation in the strict sense, is to be composed of an equal number of Senators two from each State, wholly without regard to the population of the States, wholly without regard to the ratio of the population of the States to the population of the United States, wholly without regard to the number of Senators two from each State, wholly without regard to the population of the States, wholly without regard to the ratio of the population of the States to the population of the United States, wholly without regard to the number of Senators two from each State, wholly without regard to the population of the States, wholly without regard to the ratio of the population of the States to the population of the United States, wholly without regard to the number of Senators two from each State, wholly without regard to the population of the States, wholly without regard to the ratio of the population of the States to the population of the United States, wholly without regard to the number of Senators two from each State, wholly without regard to the population of the States, wholly without regard to the ratio of the population of the States to the population of the United States, wholly without regard to the number of Senators two from each State, wholly without regard to the population of the States, wholly without regard to the ratio of the population of the States to the population of the United States.

If not only is that so, but under the Constitution no State can be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate, save by its own consent—not by a two-thirds vote of the States present and voting, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof. Not only that is so, but under the Constitution no State can be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate, save by its own consent—not by a two-thirds vote of the States present and voting, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof.

Now let it be supposed, if we say so, that before the formation of the Constitution the several States which formed the Union had met in conference to decide some important matter affecting all of them, and that the use had suggested a limitation on debate. How long would that conference have lasted under those circumstances? The representatives of those States would have said, there would have been a dissolution of the whole effort to reach any agreement whatever.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Baldwin) that Senator Frank Braggs, a Senator from Connecticut from 1805 to 1924, in a debate in the Senate some years ago very nearly covered this whole case when he made this statement:

Mr. President, I look at this right of debate not as a right, much less a privilege, which we are conferring upon ourselves as a matter of favor. I look upon it as a right which is as old as the Constitution of this Union, each of which is represented here by two Senators, and whose sole method of putting its case before the people of the United States and before this body is through the voice of its two Senators.

As I said in the forum of the states, this is a degenerated Government, in which the States are kept on the right of equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States, and made the same State, no less than the Constitution which never should be subject to amendment.

Yet, Mr. President, Senators here debate whether we should adopt a rule which will shut off debate by a so-called constitutional majority or by an actual majority and before this debate ends, the Senate will have an opportunity, no matter what vote may be made. If we begin the withdrawal process, we may be certain that we shall whittle away the substance of the rights of the States in a federal union with respect to many of their most important functions and powers.

Mr. President, our Constitution is a direct limitation on the power of the majority. If there was anything the framers of the Constitution dreaded, it was that, if there was any principle ever practiced by government anywhere which they thoroughly despised, it was the doctrine of absolutism. We can have absolutism in a legislative body. We may use many an absolutism in the Congress, if by a gas rule and by whittling away the rights of the representatives of the States to be heard and heard, and by their own consent, not by a two-thirds vote of the States present and voting, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof.

Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate is a direct limitation on the power of the majority. If there was anything the framers of the Constitution dreaded, it was that, if there was any principle ever practiced by government anywhere which they thoroughly despised, it was the doctrine of absolutism. We can have absolutism in a legislative body. We may use many an absolutism in the Congress, if by a gas rule and by whittling away the rights of the representatives of the States to be heard and heard, and by their own consent, not by a two-thirds vote of the States present and voting, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof, or by a two-thirds vote of the members thereof.

Mr. President, the Senate is a distinct institution within itself, a continuing body, only one-third of the membership of the Senate being elected every 2 years. It is not a body which chooses. Its primary function is not legislation in the strict sense. Its primary and main function, indeed, in certain important matters, partsake of the nature of conference and negotiation between sovereign bodies.
Mr. President, I do not favor cloture in the Senate of the United States; I do not favor closing of debate in the Senate, but I can conceive—I know—that unlimited and abused privileges of debate often result in very great hardship to Senators and in some hurt, in public opinion, to the Senate and its reputation. I understand that, and yet I undertake to say that I am entirely justified in filibustering against a measure, if I have never made any lengthy speech in this body; I do not now intend to do so—and in speaking at length and voting against a proposal to close debate on the merits of a question, if that question is such as to shock the sensibilities of a decent Senator. In that event any Senator is justified in resisting every effort to bring such a question before the body.

What proposed legislation would be affected? One is a proposal to abolish the poll tax. In the teeth of the textual provisions of article II of the American Constitution, no party can construe any honorable man to vote for a measure which he conscientiously believes to be contrary to the Constitution of his country. Therefore, he must vote for it, or refuse to act, or refuse to vote, or move for the adjournment of the Senate, in order to push through the poll-tax measure, the poll tax having disappeared in all but six States, as I recall, and it is on its way out even in those States. Yet the power the Senate is asked to exercise is textually in the very teeth of the American Constitution, in the second paragraph following the preamble where the power is fixed. It is not so much a matter of States' rights nor reserved rights; it is a matter of an express provision in the Constitution which fixes the standard for voting qualifications for representatives in the Congress. Likewise, subsequently, in the seventeenth amendment, in the same identical language, with respect to the election by the people of the same standard adopted in each State for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. May a Senator say that the constitutional provision not say he has a right to resist the bringing forward of a proposal which would fly in the face of the Constitution?

What is the next? Antilynching legislation. With all the vigor of my soul I deplore mob violence in any form; I have stood against it all my life, even when it hurt. But the Federal Government cannot be given power to prevent the commission of crime by mob violence in the States, unless it be asserted that the Federal Government possesses total and absolute police power. Do Senators want to say that? If a man's soul recoils from such a proposition as that, is he not justified in saying that, so long as he can prevent it, it shall not even be submitted to the Congress, and, of course, the United States for decision, either by a simple majority vote, or a constitutional majority vote. There are some persons in this body, and not a few in the Senate—who would repeal the Bill of Rights by a simple majority, or a constitutional majority, if they had the power to do so, when basically the Bill of rights is stronger but the assertion by the States themselves, when they created the Federal Government, of the absolute constitutional right of enjoyment of those immemorial rights of freemen which are above all governments, State as well as Federal. Yet there are those who would repeal the Bill of Rights, who would nullify the Declaration made by the representatives of the States in creating the Union itself, or in formulating its Constitution, which subsequently was ratified by the people of the United States as provided in the Constitution.

The States knew and the representatives of the States there present knew those principles of civil rights which constitute the things in America cannot be settled by mere majority vote; freedom of speech, abstention from the making of any law that would prohibit religion in any form or its free exercise; the denial to the Government of the power to quarter troops in the homes of the humble without their consent; the preservation inviolate of the homes and persons of the freemen in America from unreasonable searches and seizures. Yet there are some who would repeal them, and they would do so by mere majority vote, if they could; I have no doubt about that. They would certainly bring them here and submit them to the Senate and ask the Senate, under a reformed rule of procedure, to exercise its power to cut off debate, and let us have done with this thing. The Constitution is a direct limitation upon the Congress, and upon the power of the Congress itself to take away the fundamental rights of the people.

Let us look at another of these so-called civil rights which constitute the things immediately back of this movement for cloture. The American people know what it means. The so-called FEPC bill is an attempt to say to a man, "You shall not select your personal associates nor your business associates." That represents a complete undercutting of the most fundamental liberty the American people have ever enjoyed. As Donald Richberg says, it is like saying to a Christian publishing house issuing tracts and Bibles, "You must employ an atheist to peddle your goods." Every man under the American Constitution has the right to choose his associates, the men and women with whom he will meet and associate daily. Do not say to me, "You are unduly alarmed, and you are overrating it." Within a fortnight an independent judge in the State of Kentucky has said that the right of the State to close the homes of certain petitioners to join social clubs and take membership in golf clubs, because these are rights that each citizen has the power to determine for himself.

So, Mr. President, I have not the slightest doubt, so far as I am concerned, of the absolute unconstitutionality of the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, of the so-called anti-lynching bill. If it be carried beyond the mere machinery for the adjustment of differences which may arise in business organization itself. Having no doubt of the unconstitutionality of these measures, I assert my right, as one Senator from a State which has the absolute right of enjoyment of those immemorial rights of freemen which are above all governments, State as well as Federal. Yet there are those who would repeal the Bill of Rights, who would nullify the Declaration made by the representatives of the States in creating the Union itself, or in formulating its Constitution, which subsequently was ratified by the people of the United States as provided in the Constitution. I am, therefore, opposed to amending the rule so as to enable a temporary majority in the Senate, which, under the shifting tides of political emotion, if I may say it, may be a majority today and may be a minority tomorrow. There is no more stability in it than that. The appeal to me that the majority has the right to shut off debate in order to legislate simply does not address itself to my reason and to my judgment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against any amendment to the rule. I shall vote against it because I am convinced that in this high, deliberative body, when a measure possesses any real merit, there will never be a filibuster against its consideration, and it may not be any prolonged debate against final vote upon it. The only instance, in my recollection at least, in which opposition has been raised to the taking up of a measure for considered discussion of measures which I have been discussing—measures which must address themselves to many of us as being entirely repugnant to the Constitution—was the bill which we have sworn, with no reservation whatever, to uphold and to defend so far as in our power lies.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have long been of the opinion that one of the great fallacies in America is that anything can be settled if only some legislate will pass an act to that effect. That cannot be true. In all proposed legislation which is even akin to the so-called fair employment practice measure, the effort is made to control the judgments, the choice, and, if you please, the prejudices of our people. Prejudices may be ugly; they may be regrettable; but they cannot be controlled in this way. If they could be so controlled, the distinguished gentleman whose name once marked the masthead of the prohibition legislation enacted in this country would have controlled them. Mr. Volski would have ended all question about obedience to the law. Prejudice, desire, wish, and choice would have had nothing to do with it.

That is not comparable with this situation at all, because here is the bald assertion that the American in business and even in his social affairs is not free to choose his associates, the persons with whom he wishes to visit, the persons with whom he wishes to associate, the persons with whom he wishes to carry on his business. I warn the Senate that the real driving force back of FEPC is complete social rights, not merely the right to hold a job in business. Are we to bring here and vote to place a gag in our own mouths at the will of two-thirds or a constitutional majority or a bare majority of Senators on measures of this kind?
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The greatest service we could render to these United States would be to make the bold and unqualified declaration that we will not shackle the States which are here represented on the basis of equality, with respect to matters which offend against not merely tradition, but all their cultural institutions and all their deepest convictions that would be impossible to us were we to say. We should say that, regardless of pressure groups, we would follow that course.

We had read here on the 22d day of this month the Farewell Address of George Washington. Let my colleagues read it, and see if he did not stress, we could say. We should say that, the baneful influences of parties.

Now the desire is to give to the Federal Government the power within the States. That would mean that one party or two, would be able to do as it pleased, and that at a time when human governments were undergoing rapid and fundamental changes, when civilization indeed was unsteady in every part of the globe. It would mean that a bare majority here, a party majority, whether Democrat or Republican, or some other party which obtained temporary advantage, could stop debate, write the laws, and do much as it pleased. Is that what is desired? Do we wish to gamble on that? I do not.

It is customary on occasions of this kind for the majority leader to make some announcement relative to the length of time he proposes to have the Senate remain in session; whether we are to have night sessions, and how late we are to be in session today. From day to day, we may sit even later. That would mean that the Senate now take a recess until tomorrow. From now on, I may say, we are going to remain in session until 6 o'clock every afternoon and, as the debate proceeds from day to day, we may sit even later than that, I may say to the Members of the Senate and to the President of the Senate.
I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 1, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

William E. Davis, of Huntsville, Ala., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Alabama, to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Herman Feldman, G.O.744, United States Army, for appointment as the Quartermaster General, United States Army, under the provisions of section 9, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate Monday, February 28 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

Robert W. Garrison to be postmaster at Frankfort in the State of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Almighty God, from whom we come and to whom we return, grant that we may go forth today, not in criticism nor despondent mood, but in faith, sharing our sympathies in common service. With understanding minds we would realize our opportunities and our duties which we owe our country and our brother man.

We pray that in this complex world we may ever be free and loving hearts, cooparitns in a great cause; walking not in selfish ways nor forgetting the ties which bind us one to another like the moving waves of the sea, yet bound by the shore lines that unite them. Let every door which is barred by hate and revenge open to the living forms of cooperation and fellowship. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 24, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 54. An act to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

February 28, 1949.

The Honorable the Speaker, House of Representatives.

Sm: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable Louis B. Heller as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable John J. Delaney, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. HELLER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the House of Representatives, pursuant to an article written by J. Carson Adkerson, which appeared in America Monthly, entitled "Wanted! A Manganese Policy."

MANGANESE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by including a tabulation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]? There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, manganese is the "starch" in steel. There is no substitute for manganese in the manufacture of steel. Without manganese our steel mills will close down.

Dependence on Russian manganese is leading the United States into an increasingly dangerous situation. During the year 1948 the United States consumed approximately 1,500,000 tons of manganese ore. Domestic production was 118,000 tons. Imports into the United States during the year totaled 1,298,649 short tons from foreign sources as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>427,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of South Africa</td>
<td>216,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>213,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>132,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>143,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>61,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>59,894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of building up on our stockpiles, we are digging into industry stocks to meet current demands.

It is estimated that we have in stock pile in the United States little more than a year's supply of ore—just enough to fill our lines leading to the steel mills. A year without imports or domestic production and we scrape the bottom of the barrel.

The press recently announced that shipments from Russia are being tapered off and threatened with extinction. More recent reports indicate that no increase in shipments can be expected from Brazil. They will conserve their own manganese for their own needs.

We are allocating scarce steel to Canada to build railroad cars to carry manganese-bearing ores from South African mines to tidewater—and more scarce steel to build mining machinery to help develop manganese production in other countries; production which may or may not come forward years from now.

We are talking of putting our Government into the steel business when we have no guaranty that we will have sufficient manganese to supply the furnaces now in operation.

We are spending many millions of dollars through the ECA to develop mines abroad with little or no assurance that ores will be delivered to the United States for some years to come, and even should time be delivered, then at an overall cost probably greater than the cost of domestic ores.

According to testimony before the Public Lands, Mines, and Mining Subcommittees of the House, the United States needs to build up a stockpile of 8,638,000 tons for emergency needs.

We should get every ton possible from foreign sources with utmost speed and stockpile it in the United States, but we must likewise speed developments within the United States.

We have an abundance of manganese ores in the United States, with deposits in 27 States. The properties are undeveloped and milling plants are required to concentrate the ores. No money is yet available for domestic developments.

Far-reaching steps are needed to insure us adequate and dependable sources of supply of manganese without delay. Time is essential.

To help solve this problem I have introduced H. R. 2767, which proposes the purchase of domestic ores containing 15 percent or more of metallic manganese and provides for the concentration or beneficiation of the ores, if necessary, to meet specific needs provided by the Munitions Board. I have every reason to know that immediate enactment of this bill will greatly relieve our impending shortage of manganese ore. I know of no other solution for the immediate future.

The schedule of prices provided in H. R. 2767 is indicated in the following table.

Schedule of manganese ore prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of manganese content in ore</th>
<th>Price per long ton of manganese</th>
<th>Price per long ton of manganese ore</th>
<th>Price per pound of manganese contained in ore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$0.0406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0.0484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>0.0495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>0.0508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>0.0516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>0.0520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>0.0524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>0.0528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>32.80</td>
<td>0.0532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>0.0536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>36.16</td>
<td>0.0540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. HÉBERT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Recoad and include a resolution from the New Orleans Property Owners Association; also, to extend his remarks in two separate instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Recoad and include two editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Recoad in three instances; in one to include a letter, in another to include an interesting article from the Boston Sunday Post, and in the third to include an address which he made before the Lithuanian Society.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the completion of all business on the Speaker’s desk and any previous special orders granted, I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LANE)?

There was no objection.

RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMY, AIR FORCE, AND NAVY

Mr. SIKES, 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 (Mr. SIKES)?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EVINS, 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 Tennessee (Mr. Evins)?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Evins addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Recoad and include an address delivered by Hon. Carroll Johnson, a former Member of the House.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoad and include an editorial from the Washington Post of February 23.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoad and include some figures on the profits of large corporations.
Mr. Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record regarding a bill he is today introducing.

Mr. AREND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record concerning Siena Heights College, an article by Jane I. Collins.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record concerning a report and include an article written by one of his constituents.

HEART DISEASE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a magazine article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, heart disease could kill me, I tell you. We have people in our country who are suffering from heart disease.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a report and an article written by one of his constituents.

The HEART DISEASE.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a magazine article.

It would be foolishness to dodge the fact that heart disease accounts for more deaths in the United States than any single cause. But that's no excuse for clinging to hair-raising myths which frequently produce the worst of all suffering—the agony of guessing about the air we breathe. Heart disease has cost thousands of lives, and heart disease has cost millions of dollars. It is a disease that has been around for many years.

I know that due to the National Heart Act in the Eighty-sixth Congress and the campaign that is being carried on all over this country under the leadership of the National Heart Association, the people of America are aroused to this great menace. One of the dangers is that many people will perhaps become morose and distracted on the subject, and many will worry over symptoms that do not always indicate serious heart involvement.

One of the best witnesses before our committee was Mr. Paul D. White, one of the founders of the National Heart Association, a professor of medicine at Harvard University and a world-renowned authority on disease of the heart.

Yesterday there appeared in the magazine section of the Sunday Star an article by Dr. Paul White entitled “Good News About Your Heart.” I think this is one of the best articles that has been published. It should be read by every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States. I hope you will read it. I will do my best to have that something is being done to thwart and stop this No. 1 killer of mankind.

The article referred to follows:

Good News About Your Heart


(By Dr. Paul D. White, as told to John E. Pfeiffer)

There is no sure-fire symptom of heart disease, says Dr. Paul D. White. In the medical profession, the experts—people who are familiar with the symptoms of heart disease—are not always able to make an accurate diagnosis. But heart disease is not necessarily a death sentence. It can be cured if properly treated.

One of the surest symptoms of heart disease is shortness of breath. It may be caused by heart disease or by many other conditions. But it is a warning sign that something is wrong.

Other symptoms of heart disease include pain in the chest, palpitation, and shortness of breath. These symptoms may be caused by heart disease or by many other conditions. But they are an indication that something is wrong.

If you have these symptoms, you should see a doctor. He will be able to make a more accurate diagnosis and prescribe treatment.

Complete check-up

Now thoroughly scared, the patient did what he should have done in the first place—he had a complete medical check-up by his own doctor. It continued, he visited a busy local physician who listened to his heartbeats and, since the symptoms that he was having were unusually faint, quickly ascertained he had a weak heart, prescribed digoxins, and sent him to the hospital.

The heart-murmuring myth is a popular one. There is no sure-fire symptom of heart disease, but there are many signs that can indicate heart disease. These signs include:

1. Shortness of breath
2. Pain in the chest
3. Palpitation
4. Dizziness
5. Fainting
6. Palpitation
7. Numbness
8. Swollen feet

Palpitation, dizziness, faintness, swollen feet—these possible heart symptoms are more often than not signs of other ailments. In fact, we see many people who have nearly every possible symptom on the list, and they are more often than not suffering from something else.

But what about the heart disease? The answer is that heart disease is not always dangerous. A careful examination of the heart and its function will reveal whether the patient has heart disease or not.

The experts—people who preserve old-fashioned notions and pass on these notions to worried friends as sage advice—people who have the pain in the chest, palpitation or shortness of breath—or even all three—and the chances are here that they will do you good to know that something is wrong with them, but their heart muscles are all right.

Not that you should go to extremes and ignore the way you feel. It cannot be overemphasized that, although the doctor may tell you against it, any one of the symptoms mentioned above may be a sign of heart trouble. Any change in the usual daily routine that is going on all over this country under the leadership of the National Heart Association, the people of America are aroused to this great menace. One of the dangers is that many people will perhaps become morose and distracted on the subject, and many will worry over symptoms that do not always indicate serious heart involvement.

The three most prevalent causes of heart disease are blood pressure, rheumatic fever, and coronary artery disease. The last condition results from thickening of the wall of the heart arteries and is often caused by cigarette smoking. The best way to avoid heart disease is to quit smoking. The heart is probably the strongest muscle in the body. It has to beat 70 times a day to keep the body alive.
The diet treatment

High-blood pressure is sometimes treated by low-salt diets and fewer calories; overeating is tied in the case of hypertension or diseases of the heart arteries. In all cases, a patient should lose weight if he's carrying extra poundage. But a sedentary person has to stop all work, retire and die quietly is wrong. Moderate activity is just as necessary for a heart patient as for any one else. It helps the circulation active by maintaining good muscle tone throughout the body. Well-exercised legs, for example, help squeeze the blood back up through the veins to the heart and lungs. If we could keep the muscles and blood vessels functioning properly, heart disease might be less of a problem.

Another fallacy

The dread of climbing stairs is another fallacy that ought to be set straight once and for all. Normally, walking, not running, up stairs is usually good for the heart, as long as you don’t place such a strain on it that you gasp for breath. Most people now have elevators installed in their homes to avoid the exertion are wasting their money. Of course, with long trips, take occasional hikes, and keep working at their jobs.

Golf is an ideal game for many heart patients. It’s a good way to prevent obesity—scarcely a problem that tells all about the man who dropped dead the other day on the seventh fairway. Just as like as not he would have died in 10 years earlier if he’d stayed at home in his easy chair.

How to invite trouble

What can a healthy person do to avoid heart disease? One thing: a moderate amount of activity is always important. But that doesn’t mean overdoing it. High-pressure businessmen and others who are always on the go are inviting trouble. The head of a large corporation once said that he paid his executives $100,000 a year to compensate for the fact that their jobs would probably kill them within 10 years. The same risk holds for anyone who works so hard that he neglects his health.

The man who plows through the week’s work, eats heavily at lunch and dinner, and then recuperates up for the strain on his days off may very well be visiting a heart specialist sooner or later—and probably sooner. Being lazy isn’t simple a matter for week ends, and the go-getter usually can’t take it easy even then. He’s likely to play golf. We’ve all seen golfers going around the course as if he had a $10 bet on every hole.

Almost all of us take our vacations at the wrong time. The traditional 2 weeks in the summer, at the height of the hot weather and you need rest most, when work requires the most energy. According to Mayo Clinic studies, deaths from heart failure are most frequent in December, January and February. If you have only 2 weeks, the cold-weather months are the best time to get away from it all. Furthermore, it’s better to take a few days off every now and then than to use up the entire 2 weeks or more in one trip.

When it comes to diet, the base of the problem in the United States is overeating. Many office workers develop bad windows because they eat as much as they used to when they played hooky. We average 30 or 50 pounds too. There’s accumulating evidence that extra weight injures the heart. It puts a greater strain on circulation and is certainly bad for general health.

Fat can hurt you

What may actually initiate certain heart trouble is too much fat in the diet, whether it stays on the body or not. Fats may filter into the walls of the blood vessels and, after chemical processes deposits of fat on the inside. Such deposits may not only lead to hardening of the arteries but actually paralyze, or altogether disable, the entire organ, including the heart, fail to obtain enough blood. One reason that women get less heart disease is possibly because their metabolism is different and retards the formation of deposits in the arteries.

But for a person who does develop heart trouble—and such conditions are often a matter of simple aging—the outlook is anything but bright. He is one patient who came to see me a few months after he’d had a coronary thrombosis, a clot in one of the blood vessels is 60 years old, and slung a silver-fox on Prince Edward Island off the coast of Canada. He’s been a golf his days and very well be visiting a heart specialist in 2 or 3 years. The same can a healthy person do to avoid heart failure are most frequent in the early twenties.

The road ahead

We’ve learned a good deal since then. For example, we used to think that the intense chest pains of angina pectoris meant a life-destroying heart disease. Now we know that it’s more than double that figure.

Research to discover more about the fundamental causes of heart disease is steadily increasing. It gives promise of leading in the next generation to the prevention of much of the heart disease which is still too prevalent among young and middle-aged persons.

THE LATE WILLIAM E. TATE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to re­

side and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, everyone who has had close contact with veterans’ affairs and with the veterans has been in contact with the veterans’ organizations here in Washington was shocked and grieved on Thursday morn­ing to learn of the sudden death of William E. Tate, the national director of claims for the Disabled American Vet­erans.

Those of us who have served as members of the Committee on Veterans’ Af­fairs learned to depend upon Mr. Tate’s wide knowledge of the veterans’ problems, especially in the field of rehabilita­tion and compensation claims. Few men have a closer or better veteran suffering from service-connected disabili­ties. He knew without reference the complex regulations of the Veterans’ Ad­ministration and in his frequent testi­monial before our committee his judg­ment was invariably called upon and accepted.

Thousands of veterans will mourn his passing, for he had given more than 30 years of his life in service to them. He was the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans in 1927 and served as assistant national adjutant of the organization formed in 1924.

The Disabled American Veterans has been singularly unfortunate in the past few months in the loss of competent, able personnel. Only a few weeks ago the organization suffered the blow in the passing of Dr. Clayton E. Wood, its national medical director, a veteran who, also, gave of the most of his life to service for disabled veterans.

The loss of Mr. Tate the Washington office of the DAV will carry on with other dis­abled veterans who give cheerfully of their strength and time to further the cause of those who have bled to save our country. Theirs is a real service.

The following information shows the many years of loyal active service given by William E. Tate for our disabled veter­ans:

WILLIAM E. TATE

Born in Mullens, S. C., in 1896. Was edu­cated in the public schools and later was gradu­ated from the school of pharmacy, Furman University, Greenville, S. C.

Bill enlisted in the Medical Corps of the Army during World War I. Shortly after discharge was hospital­ized for disabilities incurred during his serv­ice in a period of some years in Govern­ment hospitals in North Carolina.

During this period of hospitalization he became an advocate for disabled veter­ans. He developed leadership in this field and was elected national adjutant for disabled veterans in North­ Carolina. In 1925 he was elected adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans in North Carolina.

During his ambulant hours he devoted the greater part of his time to assisting his buddies in hospital or in the preparation of their claims for Govern­ment benefits, in matters of insurance, voca­tional training and rehabilitation. From this voluntary unselfish hobby, Bill Tate de­veloped into one of the outstanding best-in­formed advocates for disabled veterans and their dependent benefits in our country.

His physical circumstances were such that his life was cut in two, but he successfully survived the early twenties. While on the other hand the newly formed veterans groups in North Carolina called more and more on him.

He is one of the few veterans in the Nation who have served as State Com­mander of the DAV in two States, North Carolina and Georgia, and State leadership he had been an adjutant and com­mander of the largest American Legion Post in Georgia and the largest in all veterans’ organizations here in Washington was shocked and grieved on Thursday morn­ing to learn of the sudden death of William E. Tate, the national director of
of Communists in Italy. Both operating outside of Russia. In Moscow that gives training to persons my opinion, he must have graduated at the national convention, Bill Tate became director of claims division activity. In the fall of 1947 we had occasion, of any other man in the development of of the State of Georgia's Veterans' Welfare organization. With the reorganization of the rank of the organization and continuous active and responsible for the financing of the national activities to the point that at the close of his year it carried the organization out of the red and into the black.

Bill Tate was one of the founders of the DAV service foundation and has served during its twenty-year years of existence as a continuous officer and has been its president for the past some several years. After having received the idea he formed a veterans' organization and based on him, he retired to the ranks of the organization and continued and constant activities, having been there a long time to time to again serve in various expert and executive capacities.

During one short period he left the active duties of the DAV to become an executive of the State of Georgia's Veterans' Welfare Department and was then drafted again to serve as a national service officer in Atlanta, Ga. Later he became assistant national adjutant at the national headquarters, where he served until he retired for a short period of time, when he was again drafted to become an assistant to Millard W. Rice, in charge of the Washington office of the organization. With the reorganization of the Washington office by the Chicago national convention, Bill Tate became director of claims and has been more responsible than any other man in the development of the organization's outstanding service officer and claims division activity.

Bill Tate m has been Myrtle Baggett on March 5, 1930, in Atlanta, Ga.

COMMUNISM IN EUROPE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, when the heretor committee visited Europe in the fall of 1945 we had occasion, of course, to give special study to communist activities in the various countries over there. I visited most of the countries except those behind the iron curtain.

In Italy we met the man who is considered to be the most astute Communist leader operating outside of Russia. In my opinion, he must have graduated at the best school in the world: Moscow that gives training to persons wishing to become Communist leaders. I refer to Palmiro Togliatti.

A few days ago Maurice Thorez, who is heading the movement in France, and Palmiro Togliatti, the head of the Communists in Italy, both declared that if it should develop that Russia should need any assistance from the Communists in France or Italy, Russia can depend upon the full support of all Communists in these two countries.

In other words agents of Joe Stalin lay down the challenge to us and they want us to know what we can expect in case we get into trouble with Russia. And these two leaders no doubt have supervision of millions of dollars of relief money furnished by the United States while they have not had one dollar from Stalin for distributing to their people do not like this situation. It is strange how the Communists can permeate our country and all the countries of the world while we have difficulty even in distributing our own relief to these countries dominated by Communists and in many countries not dominated by Communists such as France and Italy.

As a part of my remarks I include the following editorial on this subject:

A QUESTION FOR COMMUNISTS

Palmiro Togliatti, the Communist leader in Italy, now joins Maurice Thorez, his opposite number in France, in saying that in event of a war in which Soviet Russia was engaged it would be the duty of Italian Communists to aid the Soviet Army if it appeared probable that the leading Communist leaders qualified the conditions under which they said loyal Communists should act purely on the theory that the countries around the borders of their countries—but the connotation of their remarks is clear. It is that a Communist's first duty is to Moscow and not to his own country.

Now that the two leading Communist leaders in west Europe have spoken, it seems in order to address a question to the leaders of the Communist Party in the United States and in other countries. In the case of the American Communists the question might be put this way: What would be your attitude if Soviet Russia charged Canada with aggression and land an army there and pursue Canadian forces across the border of the United States? Would American Communists have supported or joined Togliatti put it, of adding in the most efficient way the Soviet Army? The event is, we hope, wildly improbable, but we have a right to know the answer.

What the purpose of the French and Italian Communist leaders in making their statement is, it is hard to say. Some cantonal elections are coming up in France and the Italian Communists have been called out to make a nation-wide demonstration today. The statements may have been intended as an incitement to militancy on the part of present party members. Surely they could not have been intended to persuade any non-Communists to join the party. The normal effect on the normal Frenchman or Italian would be negligible. It is doubtful even if the rank-and-file Communists in either France or Italy would like to see their countries dominated by the Red Army. And what aggressor are Thorez and Togliatti thinking of? A new Hitler in Germany or Marshal Stalin?

Whatever the purpose of the statements, Frenchmen, Italians, and Americans who are loyal to our own governments, to their democratic ways of life, who prefer what they have to what they would get under Red Army occupation, should be clear drawing of the lines. It neatly disposes of the theory that British Communists, say, could ever comprise His Majesty's Loyal Opposition. That Communism is only twentieth-century democracy. If this is not the proper interpretation of the remarks of M. Thorez and Signor Togliatti, then it would seem incumbent of the leaders of Communist Parties everywhere to modify the situation. In the absence of a forthright explanation, the assumption must be that the two European Communists have stated the clearest facts of Communists everywhere.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the Appendix of the Recoan and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOWTERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Recoan and include two memorials adopted by the State Legislature of Montana and an article of his own regarding rural electrification.

Mr. BYRNEs of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan in two instances, in one to include a resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors of Outagamie County, Wis., and in the other to include a progress report on the cooperative sea lamprey investigation on the Great Lakes Sea Lamprey Committee.

Mr. REED was asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan and to include a statement by a prominent constituent in his congressional district.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan and include an article upon farm support prices.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan and to include a statement by a prominent constituent in his congressional district.

Mr. DAVIES of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan and include an article on the progress of health insurance in England.

Mr. DAVIES of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan and include a statement by a prominent constituent in his congressional district.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan and include a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIES of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Recoan and include a letter.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S STATEMENT AS REPORTED UNDETECTABLE TO THE ADDRESS OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

Mr. REES. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the President saw fit to utter
the statement he is reported to have made at a public gathering on Tuesday evening.

Regardless of his reasons for being linked, and irrespective of the individual involved, that unwelcome and beneath the dignity of the office of the President of the United States to use such language. The least the President should do is to make an apology to the people having persevered himself to give vent to the statement charged to him.

I had hoped that on his Nation-wide hook-up Thursday night he would make such apology, but not such statement was forthcoming. Mr. Truman still has an opportunity to make a public expression of regret. Not to do so is a reflection upon the highest office in our land. The stigma attached to his statement should be removed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address by the Attorney General.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on matters relating to the District of Columbia be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, religious freedom—you may worship your own God—are these rights being eliminated from the face of this earth? Are we going back to the dark ages of religious persecution? What is occurring in this modern century makes me wonder. The list of suppression of religious freedom is growing from day to day. Where will it stop?

The bigoted heads of communism have attacked the Protestant, Catholic, and Jew. The present slogan of the Communists is to purge, and to continue to purge, until the last minister, priest, and rabbi is imprisoned or exterminated. This brutal attack upon Cardinal Mundelein or Monsignor Gheorghe in Bulgaria is an unerasable blot upon humanity. These unjust and imposed trials are not exceptional instances, it is not only in Hungary, it is in Latvia, Poland, and Bulgaria that the Communist form of justice is intended for—others will follow. The present situation is even more menacing than the worst of our past ordeals.

It is foolish to dream of progress and peace for the world when a dark shadow overshadows the international horizon. The trouble is that in our lifetime everything that came to be an appalling reality seemed a hoax and a fable only shortly before it came to pass. It is only natural that human beings assess the future in terms of past experiences. They fail to see even the present. Thus by sheer force of habit we have pretended to see things as they were and not as they are.

This attack upon religious freedom is a warning to every American to protect his moral and spiritual values. May we stand firmly and rebuke the encroachment of our freedom—and above all guaranty of religious worship.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

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, within the last few days I have received many communications from Members inquiring when hearings on the so-called Rankin veterans' pension bill will be held. I wish to announce now that the Committee on Rules will start holding hearings on that bill this coming Wednesday, I have been unable to have all the inquiries that have come in by mail, so I take this opportunity to make the announcement in order that the Members will be informed.

COMMUNISM WINNING ITS "COLD WAR" HERE IN WASHINGTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from speeches I made in the past.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, communism may be losing the "cold war" in Europe, but it seems to be winning its "cold war" here in Washington, especially against the white people of the District of Columbia.

Beginning with the nauseating spectacle of a mixed dance of whites and Negroes at the so-called Inaugural Ball, the Reds have moved on to other conquests.

Just a few days ago Mr. Julius A. Kruse, head of the Department of the Interior, capitulated to their demands and issued an order dragging the white children from the tennis courts in the public parks of the District of Columbia.

He called it wiping out segregation, but he, and everyone else, knows that it simply meant driving the white children out of the parks. They have been using, and turning them over to the Negroes.

Stalin must have smiled behind his mustache when he read of that communist order.

Again this morning we are told by the press that Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin has taken another lengthy step along the communist line with a recommendation advocating the passage of the infamous FEPC bill which Joe Stalin fathered in 1920.

I wonder what the next step is going to be.

What nonsense it is to pour American money by the billions, and tens of billions into the sinkholes of Europe, Asia, Africa and Israel under the pretense of fighting communism abroad, and then permit the white people of America including the white children of the District of Columbia, right under our very noses.

The truth is, this whole alleged civil-rights program is simply a communist movement to destroy the white man's civilization, to wreck this country, and to drag America down into the mire of race amalgamation, financial bankruptcy, and internal chaos.

God save our country from such a fate.

Remember that this FEPC monstrosity was set up by Executive order, and when once it was exposed on the floor of the House, the Congress killed it as dead as a door nail by refusing to appropriate money to continue its vicious persecution of the white businessmen of America.

I participated in that debate, and read into the Record a list of individuals that composed this economic gestapo.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the Record, I am going to insert that speech, together with the names of the parties selected to operate this communist outfit, which I hope every Member of Congress will take the time to study carefully.

The matter referred to reads as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means there would be a protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

If every Member of Congress would screw his courage to the sticking place and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of combined, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx, to hold up hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into a bondage, besmirched, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx, to hold up hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.
responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings. This is a band of traitors, a group directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for complaint. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from the Yankees, and we will hold onto it with a stronger grip, or let Federal bayonets hedge us closer to the ballot box of the South than it was ever again in this Republic.

But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities. If you do not drag them all over the country and try these Communists, you will find that training, and this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

Do not forget that the returning service men know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to seize the nation and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

The next thing they are going to try to do is get into the schools and force the communist henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not one out of ten these rolls is a white gentile American.

Here is the official list:

**Committee on Fair Employment Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Malcolm</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, George M.</td>
<td>Deputy Chairman</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard, Maceo</td>
<td>Hearing examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booch, Emanuel</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland, John</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley, Max</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Dorothy</td>
<td>Secretary to Chairman</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton, J. Jeanne</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Mary</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting, Myra</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 6 Negroes and 4 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

**FIELD OPERATIONS**

Here is the Division of Field Operations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maaslow, Will</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Clarence</td>
<td>Principal Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson, Edgar</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss, W. Hayes</td>
<td>Senior Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, Inez</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Eleanor</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suito, Tomi</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that it consists of nine people—three Negroes, three Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate. It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shunt to the people of his district that "I am a Republican" or "I am a Democrat." More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

**Review and Analysis Division**

Now look at this list and see who reviews your northern cities and primary offices. You will note that it consists of 11 Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Cox and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

No, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

**LEGAL DIVISION**

But if you want a real laugh, look at this legal division.

**INFORMATION DIVISION**

Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division.

**Information Division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reeves, Frank D.</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stickgold, Simon</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordone, Jeremie</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

**BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION**

Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

**Budget and Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Theodore</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetson, Sinclair</td>
<td>Assistant admin.</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Vivian D.</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Brutus A.</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayard, Minnie A.</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, Frank</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubary, Ralph N.</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Byron B.</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Elias</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes and 2 whites at all, not only makes
Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the business men of the Philadelphia area?

Now, here is the list of the regional office in Washington, D. C., the National Capital, where there has been some persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Joseph</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Theophila</td>
<td>Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn, Alice</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilton, Ruby</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urback, Dorothy</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

**REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND**

Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKnight, William</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, Ossie H</td>
<td>Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross, Letha</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley, Berniza</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wason, Edna</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Ossie R. Abbott and Edna Wason. "Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?"

**CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE**

Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James, Harold</td>
<td>Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilton, Lamarr</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE**

Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swan, Edward</td>
<td>Examiner in charge</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasse, Russel K</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>Japanese American</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the business men of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

**REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO**

Here is a list of the regional office in the Windy City:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, Elmer</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Harry H</td>
<td>Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spletz, John</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Le Roy</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zellmann, Penny</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram, Marguerite S</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zellmann. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors. Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything while our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

**REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA**

Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedder, Witherspoon</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope, John</td>
<td>Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay, George D</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chubb, Sally</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites, the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

**REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY**

Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoglund, Roy A</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orman, Eugene</td>
<td>Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Mildred</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenk, Helen G</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

**ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE**

Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Brown</td>
<td>Examiner in charge</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Levine</td>
<td>Examiner in charge</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araminta Jackson</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American business men of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three whites. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

Business men of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communist congestion to deal with, to something of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

**REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA**

Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fleming, G. James</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensblatt, Mildred</td>
<td>Fair-practice examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauds, Mable A</td>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ris, Samuel R</td>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimm, William</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorgas, Helen</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kling, Karyl</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Gracey</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$1,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greensblatt, Samuel R. Ris, and Karyl Kling.
You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select those particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

Regional office, Dallas, Tex.

The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castereda, Carlos</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vacancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez, Willett</td>
<td>Fixed-practice examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy Morton, James H. Tenada, the director, held the same position for a Negro janitor. This fellow was. You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select those particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

Regional office, New Orleans

The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellinger, W. Don..</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, James H..</td>
<td>Fixed-practice examiner</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronning, Evelyn..</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

Regional office, San Francisco

The San Francisco regional office consists of the following individuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingman, Harry L..</td>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butlidge, Edward..</td>
<td>Fixed-practice examiner</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Bernad..</td>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour, Virginia..</td>
<td>Administrative examiner</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marzen, Jewel..</td>
<td>Clerk-stenographer</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is, I am unable to say.

Los Angeles Regional Office

The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, A. Bruce..</td>
<td>Hearings examiner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of Los Angeles give to the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a super-government of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government. The people are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American Institutions.

As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

This is a battle for the survival of free institutions and for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

It is a battle to save America for Americans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial and some other information on the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial and some other information on the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

PANAM A CANAL

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 44 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to make a full and complete study and analyze the financial operation of the Panama Canal with particular reference to the proper accounting and allocation of costs attributable to:

(a) the transit of the Canal by commercial, governmental, and military vessels of the United States and foreign nations;

(b) military activities of the United States in and connected with the Canal Zone;

(c) United States civil government, including, but not limited to, sanitation, schools, playgrounds, hospitals, and so forth;

(d) business operations conducted under the supervision of the Governor General of the Panama Canal by the various business units of the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company;

and to recommend to the Congress concerning what elements of cost should be properly used in the future as the basis of a policy to be followed in establishing and maintaining tolls for the transit of the Panama Canal for transit purposes.

The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations concerning legislation as it may deem advisable to the House at the earliest practicable date, but no later than June 30, 1949.

The committee may any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States whether the Congress is in session, has recessed, or is adjourned; to hold such hearings as it deems necessary; to employ such counsel or experts, clerks, or other assistants; to travel and authorize its assistants to travel; to utilize the services of the Library of Congress; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable to the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of $15,000 per 100 words. The cost of such stenographic services shall be paid from the contingent expenses of the committee to the agency engaged in the transcription of the stenographic report and shall be included in the cost of stenographic services.

The committee may request by subpoena or other process the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall be paid from the contingent expenses of the committee to the agency engaged in the transcription of the stenographic report and shall be included in the cost of stenographic services.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, requested to defer until after submission of the committee's report any change in tolls currently levied for the use of the Panama Canal.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as my constituents may desire.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. How much general debate will there be on the bill after the rule is adopted?

The SPEAKER. This is not a bill, this is a resolution. There will be 1 hour of debate.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the resolution be subject to amendment?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Texas yields for that purpose.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield for a question.
Mr. RANKIN. I have a bill pending to abolish the Canal tolls for coastwise trade. No foreign country can engage in our coastwise trade. The American people paid for this Canal, and are keeping it up. I think they ought to be permitted to use it without being put on the same footing as foreign countries, which have nothing invested in it. Once permitted, they will use our own Panama Canal without having to pay tolls.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. It would appear that the gentleman has shown the reason for this resolution which we are now considering. That is one of the things that will be taken into consideration by the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I was not criticizing the committee, I was only to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia. I was just asking for information.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman from Virginia is not sensitive as to that at all.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it will be helpful to the House if I explain briefly the resolution before us.

In March 1949, pursuant to, as and authorized by, section 411, title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, the President issued a proclamation which would have effected changes in the toll rates levied by the Government of the United States for use of the Panama Canal. Those changes would have been effective October 1, 1948—Proclamation No. 2775 of March 26, 1948. In September 1948, the President by further proclamation prescribed that such changes in the toll rates would not be made effective until April 1, 1949, thereby permitting the Congress to investigate and make recommendations concerning the entire question of operations at the Canal. I quote the pertinent sections of the latter proclamation:

"Whereas it now appears that the Congress may be called upon to give consideration to the entire question of the cost of operation of the Canal and the tolls to be levied for the use thereof; and

"Whereas it appears consistent with the public interest to postpone the effective date of the said Proclamation No. 2775 until April 1, 1949, so as to permit continuance of the present tolls until the Congress shall have had opportunity for such consideration.

Following these proclamations the Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries introduced House Resolution 44. The committee was authorized to make a study and analysis of the financial operation of the Panama Canal. It granted the power to request by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and documents as are required. The entire purpose of the resolution is to provide helpful and factual information in a report to the House so that we may approve a general policy for the operation of the Panama Canal that is consistent with good management.

I thought it particularly timely that this resolution should come before the Congress. A very interesting article appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, prepared by Ernest O. Hauser and entitled " Richest Ditch on Earth." It was a story of the Suez Canal. I commend it to you for study and information, it will be useful to the committee or subcommittee making the investigation authorized by the resolution. I was rather startled to realize how little I, as a United States Representative, knew about the operation of the Panama Canal, a canal that has played such a vital part in the development of our country and which looks so important in the future. I am sure that the committee report will be useful and will result in helpful changes.

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

Mr. LYLE. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Will the committee, in submitting their information to the Congress, include therein, for the purpose of our guidance here, any information that is obtained pertaining to the Suez Canal, as to what tolls are charged at that canal, and the way it is managed when our shipping wants to go through the Suez Canal?

Mr. LYLE. While I am not a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as the gentleman knows, I am sure that the committee will bring to the House a helpful and full and useful report.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. While I do not know that I will head up the subcommittee, I have no doubt that every fact that is needed with the imposition of tolls will be brought to the attention of the House, and certainly any matter which any Members of the House desires to bring before Congress will be considered by the committee.

Mr. LYLE. I am sure that the gentleman and his committee will bring in, as I said, a useful and helpful report which will enable the House to make an intelligent decision on this important matter.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. May I say that the committee has had jurisdiction of the Panama Canal since 1935. At that time the jurisdiction of the Panama Canal was transferred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by action of the House, after an agreement that had been worked out between the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and myself as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The committee, as such, has not made any study of the Panama Canal tolls, because at that time, as will appear from the first order of the President, a law had been passed fixing the tolls. I have been trying to find out whether there was any investigation made by the committee. I do not think so. I certainly doubt whether the question of tolls was ever gone into very carefully by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which our distinguished Speaker was then chairman.

We want to go into all of these matters and determine them finally.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The high character and general standing and patriotism of the chairman of the committee that would do this job, I think, would be enough assurance that it will be well done. I understand that there is not any opposition whatever to the resolution. If there be none, why can we not move forward and make the determination of the problem?

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman is correct. However, the resolution must be amended to comply with the rules of the House. I will offer an amendment to strike out of the preamble the word "later."

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. As usual, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania presents a resolution for consideration, he does very careful study and consideration to the resolution and in what it intends to accomplish and the ends to be met. Consequently, being preparative as he always is, I feel that he should not be deprived of the opportunity of explaining more fully the provisions of the resolution, because I know it will be of value to the Members and at the same time it will be an example to others to prepare any resolutions or bills that they may present to the House.

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

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. COX. I must disclaim any intention of shutting the gentleman off, because now he knows what I am talking about. He has examined this whole question very carefully, and he is prepared to give information to anyone who may be in doubt as to the position they should take on the matter.

Mr. LYLE. I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] for their statements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to this resolution at this time, provided the prerogatives of the Committee on House Administration are protected by amendment, whereby the Committee on House Administration decides as to the amount of expenditure to be made.

I reserve the remainder of my time.
Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, "The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LYLE. At what time would an amendment be proper? Now, or after the committee has been ordered?

The SPEAKER. An amendment to the body of the resolution should be offered now.

Mr. LYLE. I offer an amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE:

On page 3, line 6, after the word "oaths" and the semicolon, insert the word "and.

On page 3, line 7, after the word "testimony", strike out the semicolon and the words "and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

Page 3, line 8, after the word "advisable", strike out the period and the remainder of the paragraph down to and including the word "administration" in line 14.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE: Page 1, strike out the preamble of the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein a resolution and two editorials.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. VURSELL) is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to briefly discuss the possibility of the enactment of labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. I say "possibility" because after all the noise and campaign promises, nothing has yet happened.

The Congress has been in session 57 days. The administration has a majority of 81 Democrats in the House and 12 Democrats in the Senate. The committee handling labor legislation in the House has a majority of 16 Democratic members, and 6 Republican members. The Senate Committee on Labor has 8 Democrats and 5 Republicans.

In the campaign the President and some big labor leaders who joined him promised the laboring men they would repeal the Taft-Hartley law. I rise to ask the question: Why have they not done it by now? They have not even written a bill for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate committees have enough Democratic votes on each committee to report a bill at any time to the floor of the House or Senate to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. There are enough Democrats in the House and Senate to pass this legislation without a Republican vote, and thus keep the campaign promises they made to the laboring people, if and when they want to do it.

Their excuse now is that the Republicans are blocking this legislation. That is nothing less than a conspiracy on the part of the labor leaders and administration leaders to dodge their own responsibility, and to deceive the laboring men.

Tell me—are the Republicans so much smarter, or so much more powerful that a small minority of them can prevent a heavy Democratic majority from reporting, out, or passing labor legislation?

The Republican Eightieth Congress, with a much smaller majority than the Democrats now hold, was held responsible for the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, even though a majority of the Democratic Members and Senators joined with the Republicans to override the President's veto. Certainly, the laboring men who have been promised by the party the power that they would repeal the Taft-Hartley law forthwith will now blame the administration for not making a real attempt to repeal the law. They have the ball now, and plenty of players on their team. They cannot blame their failure on us few Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, the real reason is that they are beginning to hear from the rank and file of labor, and from the people back home, generally, who now begin to realize that the Taft-Hartley law is a good law, under which labor and every man in his place. They know the people will accept nothing in a law for something they have offered nothing worth while in the past. They have the ballot now, and plenty of players on their team. They cannot blame their failure on us few Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this statement be printed in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, what does the Taft-Hartley law contain? It contains many essential provisions for the protection of the individual laborer, man—protection from the boss on the one hand, and protection from some dictatorial labor bosses on the other hand.

Many laboring men would prefer that from 13 to 18 of the principal provisions of the Taft-Hartley law be written into any legislation that takes its place.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to sample the opinion of the laboring men in two of the strongest unionized cities in my district as to what they would like in labor legislation, I mailed out 2,000 questionnaires recently to card-carrying union men representing shop workers, railroad men, members of the buildings and trade unions, and so forth, and asked them to fill out the questionnaire and give me any suggestions as to other legislation they think should be written into the new labor bill. I am prepared to tell this House what the people have to say.

I think the returns indicate that if the House came back to me on the 16 provisions contained in the Taft-Hartley law.

Approximately 30 percent of the returns urged that the 16 provisions now in the Taft-Hartley law be retained in any legislation the Congress may write.

I do not contend that if all persons contacted had replied that the percentage would always majority. In fact, one could hardly hope even a majority would so express themselves when for 2 years the labor leaders and labor papers have every week told the House that the Taft-Hartley law is a slave-labor law, and should be repealed. I think the returns indicate that possibly a majority who understand the law would vote most of the provisions of the act written into any new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I make this statement because several magazines during the past 2 years have made general Nation-wide poll among union men, and their opinion on most of the provisions I have listed. The general consensus of these polls, including a poll made by Look magazine, show that 60 to 78 percent generally approved these provisions in the Taft-Hartley law. Their prejudice had been built up much more against the law, than against its actual effect on the workers as contained in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the questionnaire as a part of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have deleted the name; however, here is the way about 60 percent of the laboring men filled out the questionnaire:


Dear Friend: The present Taft-Hartley law will either be repealed or rewritten. It is my hope that the new legislation enacted
Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders herefore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HELP WANTED: A UNITED STATES FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, why do we win the wars and lose the peace? The losing of which breeds more wars. Because we train men—career men—in the military arts, but leave our diplomacy to amateurs.

Take a recent trend. A man has become a successful soldier, a several-starred general. He has learned how to command. Then we appoint him to a diplomatic post where he must exercise the flexible and understanding talent of a conciliator.

It just does not work.

Might as well put a bull in a china shop.

Or a man has wealth, social connections, or political pull. And these are supposed to invest him overnight with all that state knowledge, international affairs, and all those other special qualities of a profession which requires years of study and experience.

Diplomacy is a vocation, not an avocation. A serious man in the United States, however, we have come to regard it as a delayed-action Cook's tour.

We pick a man who is successful and a regular fellow. We put him in charge of an embassy, which is like an island of the United States put down in the strange sea of some foreign country. He knows nothing of the language, customs, political organization, history, or policies of that country. He comes to the job tentatively, of course—and ruins the good will we have built up through the sacrifice of many American lives and the expenditure of millions of dollars. Then he is transferred. And the people back home begin to suspect that something is lacking in such an arrangement.

It could be special training for the particular job. The State Department is not entirely to blame for this failure of American diplomacy to grow up. Nor is any President to blame. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, under date line of February 21, 1949, pointed to the trouble, which only the Congress can start to remedy by legislation.
To represent American interests abroad, to report, and to negotiate.

MInd you, we call them "officers" and we refer to them as a "corps." By the very nature of their duties, they spend most of their lives outside of the United States.

This has created the problem of re-Americanization.

One of the objectives of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, was to insure that it was broadly representative of the American people and fully informed in respect to current trends in American life.

This can be achieved by the medium of a Foreign Service Academy which will give the cadets a thorough training in the traditions, the history, and the performance of our way of life, as well as that of the countries to which they are assigned.

How many Americans do we feel that our colleges and universities, as such, were taking the United States for granted, and were failing to provide that awareness of American culture and civilization, the history, and its shortcomings, which must serve as the basis of their occupations and their lives?

I submit that we cannot leave our Foreign Service to men and women who are not specially trained in Americanism first.

How many people know that our State Department and the Foreign Service are two distinct organizations, each with its own personnel, appropriations, and administration?

This dual structure makes the United States today the only major power with its foreign affairs organization divided into two segments and often alienated, one from the other.

Our Foreign Service personnel, to keep in touch with their fellow-Americans and the viewpoint of Americans, that we must serve in the United States for longer periods than actually is the case today.

Does not this signify, in part, lack of a unified, basic training for the Foreign Service?

In this one-world atomic age we cannot rely upon cloistered scholars nor upon those who have acquired most of their formal education in foreign countries to provide the personnel to represent us in diplomacy.

Our own colleges and universities do not offer complete professional training in Foreign Service as a career.

Furthermore, committed in their approach because such training is a primary function of the Government and should be provided by the Government.

It is within the permanent structure of the Government, as distinguished from the changing administrations of Government, whether they be Democratic or Republican.

As yet, this concept has not taken root in the work of the State Department.

To fill this gap, my bill would authorize a Foreign Service Academy, which will provide the trained officers necessary to measure up to our new responsibilities as one of the two major powers in world affairs.

To fill this gap, my bill would authorize the Secretary of State to establish or maintain, in or near the District of Columbia, an academy to train men and women for careers in our Foreign Service.

In prescribing the curriculum, the Secretary shall provide that special emphasis be placed on the study of the history, culture, customs, folklore, and languages of the nations which the trainees select as a major subject of study.

They shall not only be versed in the ability to understand and report the viewpoints of the governments and the people of the countries to which they may be assigned; they must be able, also, adequately to explain the United States and its people to foreigners.

They must be competent and tactful in the presentation of our informational programs and in the art of promoting, in spite of difficult barriers, the development of international understanding and good will.

This will require special talents and special studies.

The opportunity to attend the Academy will be open to all Americans of good character who pass the competitive examinations. Limitation of number of the highest marks which may fill a yearly quota.

While in attendance at the academy, the students, whatever their other necessary expenses shall be paid for by the Government.

In making original appointments of permanent officers in the Foreign Service, preference shall be given to graduates of the academy, after they have served 2 years as temporary employees at foreign stations.

There shall be appointed each year a board of visitors to the academy, which shall consist of five members from the Senate and five members from the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen of such committees.

The board of visitors shall exercise the same functions as is provided in the case of the board of visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of our Government recently charged the National Intelligence Unit is the weakest and least effective in the State Department, and that its relationships with the Central Intelligence Agency partake of rivalry rather than cooperation.

The State Department's relationship with the press and other media of public information are extremely weak, the report added.

The Congress, should it authorize a Foreign Service academy, will insist on adequate training of personnel to remedy these deficiencies.

United Nations in swaddling clothes, the Truman Doctrine, Marshall plan, cold war, Russian expansionism, satellites, the cancer of communism, propaganda, and the hope of independence among colonial peoples, in this welter of swiftly changing events, the United States will need the best men to represent our interests.

The academy in the atomic age must grow up.

In the world assembly of the future, men and women who are thoroughly
schooled in the American way of life and in the relationship between our Nation and other nations will be among the most distinguishing traits of our country, has produced or will produce.

And I am sure that many of them will be graduates of the United States Foreign Service Academy.

To this end, I ask your support of H. R. 471.

The time to prepare for the future is today.

PULASKI MEMORIAL HOUR ON MARCH 4

Mr. SABATI. 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. SABATI. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 4, 1949, will be the two hundred and fourteenth anniversary of the birth of the renowned Polish-American hero, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. I feel it would be proper and fitting in recognition of his services to our country and in respect to his memory to pay a tribute to him in the House on his birthday anniversary.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of legislative business on that day that I be recognized for 1 hour for that purpose.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

CINCINNATI AND THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I happened to have been born and raised in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, which city has been known throughout the world as the Queen City of the West and as a place of which we are all justly proud.

Our city has an excellent reputation for progressiveness, peace, and quiet. Our community is made up of different groups of which have been banded together to help make this the greatest Nation in the world. We have an excellent record with reference to brotherhood, racial and religious relations, and all of us meet together periodically to discuss our problems and work out the same. Class hatred is an unknown quantity in our community.

On Saturday, February 26, 1949, and throughout the week up to and including Saturday, March 5, we are celebrating Brotherhood Week, a time when we rejoice and are glad that tumultuous groups has never existed in our community.

However, on last Saturday, February 26, 1949, certain individuals who call themselves the Hamilton County Communist Party came out of their hiding places and attempted to disrupt the peaceful people of our community. They attempted to stir up unrest among our people by appealing to religious prejudice through mimeographed sheets which were distributed in certain sections of our fair city. Like rats coming out of sewers they picked their ugly heads out into the open just long enough to attempt their nefarious purpose, and then immediately went back into hiding. None of them had the courage to affix his or her name to the scurrilous literature which they circulated.

In our community also we are very fortunate in having several civic-minded radio stations, among which one of the most informative is WCPO which is owned and operated by our city's best newspapers, the Cincinnati Post. Mr. Robert Otto, the news commentator on radio station WCPO, was the person who first brought to light this despicable attempt to inflame our people, and I quote from the broadcast made by Mr. Otto at 4 p.m. on Saturday, February 26, 1949, over radio station WCPO:

Communists came out of hiding in the Cinti area today in a move obviously designed to inflame members of the Jewish community against Catholics.

Mimeographed pieces bearing the heading, "Mindszenty anti-Semitic" were circulated among pancreas at prominent corners in Avondale. The inflammatory letters ironically were being peddled to the local observance of Brotherhood Week, on the Jewish Sabbath and on the eve of the Catholic observance of the Holy Hour of the Sacred Heart.

The letters referred to the Catholic Primate of Hungary, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, who now is being kept behind bars on defamatory libel charges. It took place of which we are all justly proud.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of legislative business on that day that I be recognized for 1 hour for that purpose.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

277. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 involving a decrease of $44,882,000 for the Veterans' Administration in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Appropriations and an editorial.
1949
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ization in the Federal Government (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

27. A letter from the Chairman, Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on the national security organization and, separately, as appendix G, a part of the report of the task force assigned to examine this organization, transmittable to the Committee on Armed Services.

28. A letter from the Chairman, Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on the national security organization of the Executive Branch; to the Committee on Armed Services.

29. A letter from the Chairman, Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting its report on the national security organization offered for consideration by the Committee; together with accompaniing papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Cape Fear River and below Wilmington, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on April 14, 1937, and the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946, and the Water Resources Development Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

30. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 15, 1946, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Brasos River and tributaries, Texas; and the Southwestern River basin tributary, authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and August 28, 1937, and by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

31. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 15, 1946, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Warroad Harbor and River, Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works on the report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Warroad Harbor and River, Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

32. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Saw Mill River, New York, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

33. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 14, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cedar Bayou Pass, Corpus Christi Pass, and pass at Mudlock's Landing, Texas, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

34. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting copies of orders of the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

35. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain personnel and agencies of the United States to operate and administer in the district courts of the United States, at Westport, New York, and pass at Murdock's Landing, Texas, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

36. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the construction and equipment of a laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

37. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

38. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Public Lands.

39. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the United States Public Health Service to accept certain gifts tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Forestry.

40. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on National Service.

41. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 26, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on April 14, 1937, and the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on February 7, 1940 (H. Res. 91); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

321. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 15, 1946, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Warroad Harbor and River, Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

322. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 15, 1946, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Warroad Harbor and River, Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

323. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Saw Mill River, New York, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

324. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 14, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cedar Bayou Pass, Corpus Christi Pass, and pass at Mudlock's Landing, Texas, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

325. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting copies of orders of the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

326. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the construction and equipment of a laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

327. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for a Resident Commissioner to the United States in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

328. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Public Lands.

329. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on National Service.

330. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 15, 1946, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on April 14, 1946, and the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946, and the Water Resources Development Act of 1948; to the Committee on Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on February 7, 1940 (H. Res. 91); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

331. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the development of tourist and other interests on the highway, including the Alaska Highway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Committee on Public Lands.

332. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend section 931 of the Federal Civil Service Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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


Mr. GHAMA: Joint Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 157. A bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and award to young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal forBravery and Military Valour; with amendments (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:
H. R. 4469. A bill for compre­ hensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal buildings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEFAN:
H. R. 3020. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleo­ margarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHAFFER:
H. R. 4422. A bill to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif., to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:
H. R. 3023. A bill amending Public Law 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRESTON:
H. R. 3024. A bill to provide for the dis­ charge from the armed forces of persons who were married at the time of their induction to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTEN:
H. R. 3032. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act), to extend its duration; and to provide for assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3026. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORSKI of New York:

H. R. 3027. A bill to provide pays increases for married Guard Service personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 3028. A bill to provide for a new post-office building in Windber, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3029. An amendment to the National Service Act of 1940 to remove racial barriers to naturalization with respect to spouses and children of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOOGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3030. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3031. A bill to grant travel and subsistence allowances to the next of kin attending government remains of known individuals returned to the United States for interment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 3032. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3033. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKITT of Georgia:

H. R. 3034. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Savannah River below Augusta, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARNABAN:

H. R. 3035. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 with respect to the terms "brother" and "sister"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3036. A bill to regulate oleomargarine to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3037. A bill to amend section 2669 of title 39, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3038. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to repair and remodel the Belasco Theater and rent it out to the performing arts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3039. A bill to amend section 302 (c) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retiring Act, 1946, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 3041. A bill to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control, and other improvements on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3041. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 3042. A bill to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien shepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3043. A bill to assist in bringing about a more sound agricultural economy through diversification of its productive resources; to incorporate the main basic laws and principles relating to domestically raising fur-bearing animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 3044. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting or registering; to vote in an election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEEPER:

H. R. 3045. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 3046. A bill to authorize the expansion of facilities at the Cape Vincent, N.Y., fish-cultural station; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAY:

H. R. 3047. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Albion, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3048. A bill to provide that the next of kin of certain persons who died while serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be permitted to collect weekly and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARQUARD:

H. R. 3049. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to extend assistance to certain veterans with wartime service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3050. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to extend assistance to certain veterans with wartime service-connected blindness in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McLEGOR:

H. R. 3051. A bill to reduce to 10 percent the rate of withholding of tax on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 3052. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk; and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3053. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3054. A bill to authorize the purpose of erecting an adequate terminal annex post office in Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3055. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 3056. A bill to provide for the disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 3057. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that certain chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 3058. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3059. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3060. A bill to create additional Security Room facilities for Reserve component; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3061. A bill to establish a committee for the purpose of purchasing certain property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3062. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALLEY:

H. R. 3063. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGRO:

H. R. 3064. A bill to authorize waiver of statutory and regulatory limitations in meritorious cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3065. A bill to authorize Secretary of the Army to enter into certain contracts for sale of electric power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3066. A bill to authorize the issuance of special commemorative silver half dollars in honor of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3067. A bill relating to full-time institutional trade and industrial training for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3068. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the American Legion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3069. A bill to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WENDEL:

H. R. 3070. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 3071. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase certain property in Marquette County; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3072. A bill to establish a Bureau of Reserve Affairs in the Department of the Army and in the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution for the approval of Atlantic Defense Pact; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their House Joint Memorial 6, requesting the introduction of an appropriate legislation for the appropriation of funds for the building of the Custer Battlefield Museum, at Custer, In the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available the sum of $2,000,000 for the construction of the Idaho Central Highway from Trude, Idaho, to Mountain Home, Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 842, which calls for payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned real property so as to reimburse States and local governments, bringing about substantial equity between local and Federal taxpayers with respect to Federally owned real property; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COOPER: H. R. 3073. A bill for the relief of Loretta Ann Ferry and Helen Claire Cherry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS: H. R. 3074. A bill to provide for the relief of Elsie Noot; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLMES: H. R. 3075. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 1,946,542, issued February 23, 1929, relating to carrying bags; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI: H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of Jerome Hendrik Boogerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL: H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTER: H. R. 3078. A bill providing for the renewal of design patent No. D-89522, issued June 11, 1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON: H. R. 3080. A bill for the relief of Karl L. Doe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELDON: H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy M. Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

124. By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma: Memorial of the Mississippi Legislature, asking Congress to appropriate funds for the care and support of needy and destitute Indians; to the Committee on Appropriations.

125. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds adequately to aid in a modern way the important economic and social well-being; to the Committee on Appropriations.

126. By Mr. PATTON: Memorial of the State of Arizona, requesting the decontrol of war industries and calling attention to the advantages of Arizona as a location for war industries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

127. Also, memorial of the State of Arizona, proposing decontrol of rental housing in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

128. By Mr. MANSFIELD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting the Eighty-first Congress to introduce and pass the Veterans’ Economic Development Act as embodied in H. R. 521 and S. 169; Eighty-second Congress, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

129. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies, Jersey City, N. J., protesting the unjust, unwarranted, and cruel sentence imposed by the Government of the Hungarian Government upon Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

130. Also, petition of the Catholic Youth Organization, Hudson County Catholic Youth Center, of Jersey City, N. J., condemning the Communist-dominated proceedings which resulted in the sentencing of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment as a traitor to justice and an affront to all freedom-loving peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

131. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Harrison County, N. J., condemning the Communist-dominated proceedings which resulted in the sentencing of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment as a traitor to justice and an affront to all freedom-loving peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

132. By Mr. MANSFIELD: Memorial of the State of Arizona, requesting Congress to provide recreational facilities in the Lake Mead National Recreational Area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

133. Also, memorial of the State of Arizona, requesting immediate action with respect to federal lands and water resources; to the Committee on Public Lands.

134. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank W. Croxton, secretary of the Committee for MVA, Omaha, Nebr., petitioning consideration of their resolution urging immediate creation of a Missouri Valley Administration, patterned after the successful Tennessee Valley Authority, also urging congressional investigation of water-development and lobbying organizations and memberships and financing; to the Committee on Public Works.

135. Also, petition of Mrs. Ella Adams, secretary, Boynton Beach Woman’s Club, No. 1 Boynton Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution requesting immediate action, consideration, and enactment of the proposed legislation known as the Town and Gown plan, H. R. 2315, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

136. By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the State of Colorado, requesting that Congress enact legislation providing for the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the decentralization of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Denver; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

137. Also, memorial of the State of Colorado, requesting the Congress to enact legislation to make Indians citizens of the United States in order that they may be able to vote; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

The Senate met at 12 o’clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou knowest our frame and rememberest that we are dust. Thy patience outlasts all the dulness of our apprehension and the dimness of our vision.

Today we come for light enough to work. Save us from the futile repetition of old errors and the restoration of old evils. Let not ignorance nor mean partisanship nor selfish greed nor the temptations of privilege block the way to a new order in the world with hope of lasting peace, enlarging brotherhood and increasing opportunities for all Thy children. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations and authorizing appropriations therefor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONTINUING FUND FOR PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office chargeable to lapsed appropriations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.