SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

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:

Our Father God, from all the traditions which separate us and write our names in different camps of thought and conviction we pause for the upward look which makes us one in solemn, yet glad, communion with Thee.

Teach us so to live and so to toil and so to play our part in this age on ages telling that we may face with clear conscience the gaze of our contemporaries and the judgment of posterity. May our attitudes and hopes widen every area of good will within the reach of our influence. In a divided, fear-haunted, violent world, may we be among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed, because the record shall write our names among today's peacemakers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 17, 1950, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today, through Wednesday.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Malone
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Morse
Butler	Hunt	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Murray
Capehart	Jenner	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kefauver	Robertson
Darby	Kem	Russell
Donnell	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Downey	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Leahy	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Taylor
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the Vice President's office at the present time are 14 members of the Japanese Diet. They are now visiting this country to study the organization and procedures of the United States Congress and of various State legislatures. I respectfully request the Vice President to direct the Sergeant at Arms to escort these distinguished visitors into the Senate Chamber in order that they may witness the Senate procedure. Following the preliminary proceeding we will take a recess of some 20 minutes in order that we may all become better acquainted with these men from Japan.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will escort the distinguished visitors into the Senate Chamber.

The visiting members of the Japanese Diet, escorted by the Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The SERGEANT AT ARMS (Joseph C. Duke). Mr. President, I have the honor to present members of the Diet of Japan. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state what the Senate, of course, already knows, that members of parliamentary bodies of other nations are entitled to the courtesy of the floor during any visit they make here.

The members of the delegation from the Japanese Diet were escorted to the seats assigned them in the rear of the Chamber.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and without speeches.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Attorney General of the United States, withdrawing the names of Heather Mary Bocko or Heather Mary Gill, and Fanny Sara Moritz or Fannie Sarah Moritz, from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on May 1, 1949, and January 16, 1950, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY NAVY DEPARTMENT RELATING TO NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements entered into by the Navy Department relating to naval petroleum reserves (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED TIN SMELTER, TEXAS CITY, TEX.

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for the purchase and sale of tin metal, during the 6 months ended December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committeee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, of all the names, salaries, and duties of employees and officers in the employ of the Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SERVICEMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Cheever Evans, Merill N. Penn, and Robert T. Peterson, Legislative Committee, Lloyd E. Frost Post, No. 4084, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Ridgecrest, Calif., praying

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

The petitions of Bruce Merlington, of Cedar Springs, Mich., and Martha Chesbro, parliamentarian of Post No. 4198, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Raynesford, Mont., praying for the enactment of House bill 4617, to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the California Motor Transport Associations, Inc., of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the tax on the transportation of property, and the Federal automotive excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Hosea V. Smith, clerk, of the Free Will Baptist Church, of Mount Vernon, Ill., relating to legalized gambling; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Military Order of World Wars, of Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide a world government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of John C. Sarracino, Governor, Pueblo of Laguna, N. Mex., remonstrating against the enactment of certain provisions of Senate bill 75, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolution adopted by the women's board of Doctors Hospital, and the women's board of the Polyclinic Hospital, both of Cleveland, Ohio, and the Outagamie County Dental Society, of Appleton, Wis., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the crew of the steamship *American Shipper*, of Baltimore, Md., relating to amendment of the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Lanvaner, of Forest Grove, Oreg., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1103 and House bill 2945, to adjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing a flood-control dam on Charlotte River, Davenport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States, to make an immediate, thorough, and exhaustive study and investigation of the loyalty of the members, officers, and employees of the State Department, and to take such further appropriate action to rid the Department of State of procommunistic employees in order that the safety of our Nation will not be further endangered by men in high places who condone acts of treason which endanger the safety of the United States of America and the people.

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house concurring therein):

"Whereas through the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation Alger Hiss was twice tried in the Federal courts of the United States of America, and convicted of the crime of perjury; and

"Whereas members of the United States Supreme Court, Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed, voluntarily testified in the first trial as character witnesses, thereby breaking all of the precedents heretofore existing in relation to our Federal courts, and creating in the minds of the American people a disregard for members of our Federal judiciary; and

"Whereas upon the conviction by a Federal jury in a Federal court of the said Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, issued a prepared and considered statement in which he said, 'I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss,' which statement was designed to belittle the actions of an American jury in an American court and to raise in the minds of the American people a doubt as to the guilt of one of Dean Acheson's friends and former State Department employee in spite of, and in total disregard of, results of a free and fair trial and a verdict rendered by a jury as provided by the Constitution and the laws of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency the President of the United States to make an immediate check of the loyalties and beliefs of the men employed in the State Department of the United States, from Dean Acheson on down, to determine whether or not the ideas and ideals of such individuals are such that the American people can have continued faith that such Department, through its representatives, will safely keep and guard the secrets of the United States of America from foreign enemies and that such Department and its employees in preparing and carrying out a foreign policy in relation to Russia and other foreign countries will adopt and carry out policies which are not contrary to the ideas and ideals of the American people as expressed by the Constitution of the United States and the laws adopted thereunder; be it further

"Resolved, That His Excellency the President of the United States make immediately available to the House Un-American Activities Committee all secret files and lists and reports of investigations covering the loyalties and activities of any and all employees of the Government of the United States which in any way show or indicate disloyalty to the United States of America as expressed by Communist membership or otherwise; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to United States Senator CHAN GURNEY, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to Congressman FRANCIS H. CASE, to Congressman HAROLD LOVRE, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"A. E. MUNCK,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 24

"Whereas the Congress is considering a measure which would repeal or reduce the depletion allowance now made in connection with income taxes on producers of natural resources; and

"Whereas the economy of the State of Texas to a great degree is tied up with the production of natural resources; and

"Whereas these industries furnish a large portion of the revenue for the support of the State government, including its public-school system and its welfare and other programs, and

"Whereas prospecting for new reserves is a hazardous and expensive operation; and

"Whereas the elimination or reduction of the present allowance for depletion would tend to create unemployment and would seriously cripple these industries, and particularly the smaller units and independents who have been the backbone of these industries; and further would seriously retard the search for and development of new sources of supply vitally necessary to this country, particularly in case of war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That the Congress of these United States be and is respectfully urged to defeat this attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance, and thereby to preserve the economy of the various States and assist in preparing this country to defend herself, if necessary; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be wired immediately to Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of these United States; and that copies hereof be mailed to the Representatives and Senators in Congress from the State of Texas.

"GRADY HAZLEWOOD,
"President Pro Tempore of the Senate."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation reimbursing those individuals who were drafted into the service in 1940, the difference between the base pay of a private of $21 per month and $50 per month which became the base pay of a private soldier 2 years later

"Whereas in 1940, due to a national emergency, the Congress of the United States enacted legislation which drafted into the service of our country thousands of young men who, while anxious to make any sacrifice for the defense of their land, were nevertheless most desirous of continuing their chosen professions and businesses in civilian life; and

"Whereas these young men were drafted into the armed forces and served willingly and with honor and credit; and

"Whereas these Americans in many cases gave up lucrative and highly paying positions and served for $21 per month for a period of about 2 years, when the base pay of a private soldier was raised to $50 per month, and by so doing, Congress recognized the inequity of the scale of pay for the different grades of rank; and

"Whereas Congress has never recognized the very pertinent fact that these men who were drafted and served for $21 per month for about 2 years form a large bloc of Americans to whom some form of additional remuneration is justly due; and

"Whereas many of these men returned to civilian pursuits after the cessation of hostilities only to find that their savings were gone and the matter of starting again was a long, expensive, and difficult task: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation immediately, giving those men who were drafted into the service on account of the national emergency in 1940, the difference between the $21 of a private and $50

which became the pay of the private soldier later, which payment will only partially reimburse these men for the financial sacrifices that they were called upon to make on account of the national emergency; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to furnish a copy of this resolution to the two United States Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from South Carolina, and to each of the State commanders of each veterans' organization in the United States, and to each national commander of such organizations."

TAXES ON ADMISSIONS TO CERTAIN ATHLETIC CONTESTS — RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the removal of the existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to remove existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing any existing requirement of law that any admission or other tax be imposed or collected upon tickets for admission to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 6, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 9, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

LONG-RANGE SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF QUINCY, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of Quincy, Mass., favoring the adoption of a long-range shipbuilding program.

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

Whereas employment in shipbuilding is decreasing nationally on a scale to cause serious concern, not only to shipworkers but to all thoughtful citizens; and

Whereas shipbuilding has played an important part in the growth and development of the city of Quincy, Mass.: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Quincy City Council in regular meeting, That the preservation of shipbuilding skills, the protection of foreign commerce, and the protection of the Nation's defense, demands adoption by the 1950 Congress of the United States of a long-range shipbuilding program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to United States Senators from Massachusetts, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and HENRY CABOT LODGE, and all Members of Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

EXCISE TAXES ON TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION SERVICES—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA STATE RAILWAY COMMISSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Nebraska State Railway Commission on February 7, 1950, concerning the present Federal excise taxes on transportation and communication services.

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

Resolution 156

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on transportation and communication services were initially levied to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary travel and communication; and

Whereas almost 5 years have elapsed since the end of the war, and the urgent need for the levying of such taxes no longer exists; and

Whereas said taxes are discriminatory against the long distance users of transportation and communication services, and against Nebraska citizens because they are far removed from centers of population; and

Whereas the taxes are calculated on a percentage rather than on a flat basis and increases of rates necessitated since the end of the war have greatly increased the amount of tax; and

Whereas the tax as applied to rural and exchange services is grossly unfair and inequitable and has become more burdensome by reason of increases in exchange service rates made necessary by large increases in costs of rendering service with consequent pyramiding of taxes thereon; and

Whereas because of increases in rates for transportation and communication services, a decrease in traffic and a decline in economic status of the users of service, particularly the rural subscriber of telephone service, a situation has been created where the use of exchange services has reached a point of diminishing returns: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska State Railway Commission is of the opinion that the present excise taxes on transportation and communication services are inimical to the maintenance and use of transportation and communication facilities and should be completely repealed; and further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Kenneth S. Wherry and Hugh A. Butler, United States Senators, and to Carl T. Curtis, Eugene D. O'Sullivan, Karl Stefan, and A. L. Miller, Representatives of Congress, and to Walter R. McDonald, General Solicitor of the NARUC.

Adopted at Lincoln, Nebr., this 7th day of February 1950, at regular session.

THE NEBRASKA STATE RAILWAY COMMISSION,
HAROLD A. PALMER, *Chairman.*
WALTER E. ROBERTS, *Commissioner.*
RICHARD H. LARSON, *Commissioner.*

Attest:

JOSEPH J. BROWN,
Secretary.

CLEAR CHANNELS IN RADIO—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, relating to clear channels in radio for the dissemination of farm news.

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

Farm people generally are having to depend primarily upon clear-channel radio-broadcasting stations for their radio information and dissemination of their programs to others. This will continue unless unforeseen new developments improve transmission and reception. We therefore firmly oppose any reduction in the number of clear-channel stations. We urge that the frequencies of clear-channel stations be held inviolate by international agreement and that the power of these stations be increased to allow for complete coverage to all areas in territories of the respective stations. We ask that radio service to farmers by substations be maintained and improved with reference to the special needs of people on farms.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED UNDER FOREIGN TRADE ZONES ACT—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN WAREHOUSEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution which was adopted by the fifty-ninth annual convention of the American Warehousemen's Association in Chicago early this month. The resolution was sent to me by Harold M. Willardson, president of the Milwaukee Warehousemen's Association, who, like his associates in this industry throughout the country, is deeply interested in the passage of certain legislation to remove restrictions which have been imposed by the activities in the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934.

Naturally I share the deep interest of these warehousemen in facilitating world trade, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

Whereas the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 (title 19, section 81 A.-U, USCA) was enacted for the purpose of creating free ports wherein many operations essential to foreign commerce may be carried on without the burdensome intricacies of customs, laws and regulations applicable to ordinary ports of entry; and

Whereas the purpose of said act, namely to promote, stimulate, and facilitate international commerce, has not been entirely achieved by reason of undue restrictions against certain activities within foreign trade zones notably the activity of manufacturing and exhibiting; and

Whereas H. R. 2163, a bill, has been introduced into the present session of the Eighty-first Congress by Representatives BOGGS and CELLER for the purpose of removing these restrictions imposed by the activities in Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934; and

Whereas the achievement for the purposes of the said Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 have been further hampered by confining foreign trade zones privileges to an extremely narrow and limited orb, namely the few foreign trade zones created by the Foreign Trade Zones Board pursuant to the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934; and

Whereas we held that the extension of foreign trade zones privileges (as reflected in the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 and as proposed to be amended by the aforesaid Boggs-Celler bill) to qualified warehousemen will stimulate, promote and foster foreign commerce; facilitate the handling of commodities and materials shipped, stored, and handled in foreign commerce; stabilize world trade and cure the deficiencies of imports as compared with exports and materially contribute to the peace and economic well-being of the world; and

Whereas all of these aims and purposes are provided for in H. R. 4723, a bill introduced by Representative BOGGS into the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and referred to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the said H. R. 4723 does no violence to the customs of the United States or to the principles of the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934 but is, on the contrary, thoroughly consistent with all of the tariff laws and regulations promulgated thereunder, and with the principles of the Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Warehousemen's Association merchandise division, in convention assembled thereby lauds the aims, objects, and purposes of H. R. 4723 and enthusiastically endorses and urges its passage by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Representative BOGGS, to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, President of the United States, and to such additional Representatives and Senators and to such other officials and agencies of the Government as may be designated by the AWA merchandise division committee on foreign trade zones.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

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

S. 2853. A bill to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift; with amendments (Rept. No. 1277).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

George W. Whitehurst, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida; and

Frank A. Hooper, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 3058. A bill for the relief of Nessie S. Widler; and

S. 3059. A bill for the relief of John J. Sebenick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3060. A bill for the relief of Petr Zenkl and his wife, Paula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3061. A bill for the relief of Dr. E. Gunnar Johansson; and

S. 3062. A bill for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3063. A bill to allow additional credits for income-tax purposes in the case of persons reaching the ages of 75 and 85 years; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3064. A bill to increase annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 by 25 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3065. A bill to authorize loans to assist farmers in clearing cut-over timber lands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3066. A bill for the relief of Dionisio Aguirre Irastorza; and

S. 3067. A bill for the relief of Andres Aguirre Irastorza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 3068. A bill for the relief of the adopted child of Lt. and Mrs. Neill C. Burnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 3069, to establish a Bureau of Passports and Visas to be headed by a director, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 3070. A bill authorizing the naturalization of George Mikroulis; and

S. 3071. A bill for the relief of Maria P. Sigioltzakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 3072. A bill to provide benefits for members of the reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3073. A bill for the relief of Sono Mary Theresa Nishimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request) introduced Senate bill 3074, to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3075. A bill for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3076. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act; and

S. 3077. A bill for the relief of Shizu Fujii and her son Suenori Fujii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3078. A bill to define service of certain members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service;

S. 3079 (by request). A bill to define misconduct for compensation and pension purposes under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; and

S. 3080 (by request). A bill to provide allowance of death pension when death in service is denied service-connection; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 3081. A bill to provide for boundary adjustments of the Badlands National Monument, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. PEPPER):

S. 3082. A bill for the relief of Erika Kuebart and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3083. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa J. Cason; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3084. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to the memory of Henry Milton Brainard at Cape Arago Light Station in Coos County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3085. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Nebraska over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; and

S. 3086. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees under jurisdiction of the Winnebago Indian agency in Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 3087. A bill to authorize an appropriation for cooperation with the Gallup Board of Education, New Mexico, for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school buildings to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate bill 3088, to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration from the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

BUREAU OF PASSPORTS AND VISAS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Bureau of Passports and Visas to be headed by a director, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, and an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3069) to establish a Bureau of Passports and Visas to be headed by a director, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 153; 8 U. S. C. 201), be amended by adding a new section to be known as section 2A as follows:

"2A. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Passports and Visas to be headed by a Director with rank and compensation not less than that of an Assistant Secretary of State. The Director shall be a native-born citizen of the United States with not less than 10 years'

experience in the Foreign Service of the United States, and shall have attained at least class one in the Foreign Service. He shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) The functions of the Visa Division and of the Passport Division of the Department of State are hereby transferred to the Bureau of Passports and Visas and the functions of the Chiefs and other officers and employees of the Visa Division and of the Passport Division are hereby transferred to the Director for redelegation and redistribution by him in his discretion.

"(c) The Director shall have authority to maintain direct and continuous liaison with the Directors of Federal Bureau of Investigation, Central Intelligence Agency, and other internal-security officers of the Government for the purpose of obtaining and exchanging information in enforcing the provisions of this act in the interest of the internal security of the United States. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Director shall maintain direct and continuous liaison with each other with a view to a coordinated, uniform, and efficient administration of this act.

"(d) Within the Bureau of Passports and Visas there shall be a Visa Division and a Passport Division each to be headed by a Chief having at least 10 years' experience in administering the immigration and nationality laws. There shall also be a law officer designated to serve as general counsel of the Bureau of Passports and Visas who shall have authority to maintain liaison with the appropriate officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service with a view to uniform interpretation of the provisions of this act.

"(e) Estimates of expenditures to be made by the Bureau of Passports and Visas of the Department of State shall be separately stated in the budgets submitted by the President for such Department; and appropriations for such Bureau shall be separately stated in all acts making appropriations for such Department and shall not be available for expenditure for any other function.

"(f) The Director shall perform his duties under the general direction of the Secretary of State."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CARRAN

Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill providing for the creation in the Department of State of a Bureau of Passports and Visas, to be headed by a Director, who will rank not lower and have compensation not less than that of an Assistant Secretary of State. The introduction of this bill is prompted by the results of the testimony given before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Judiciary Committee by officers of the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and other officers of the Government. It will be recalled that the Senate authorized the Judiciary Committee to make a study of the various provisions and operations of our immigration and naturalization laws.

We have heard testimony from the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, the Chief and other officers of the Visa Division, and we have studied the operations of the Passport Division, of the Department of State. We have heard testimony from the Attorney General and officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and we have heard testimony from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. In the light of this testimony I have come to the unavoidable conclusion that there is something wrong in the present organization of the Department of State and I believe that Congress should step in and straighten out some of the organizational deficiencies which need attention at the earliest possible moment. It has been too easy for subversive aliens to obtain visas with which to apply for admission into the United States at ports of entry in this country, where they and their backgrounds are unknown to the immigration officials. We have also noted that certain American citizens with subversive or questionable records have been able to obtain American passports, with which they have proceeded abroad for purposes which obviously are not in the interests of the security and safety of the United States.

My inquiries and studies concerning the provisions and operations of our immigration laws have convinced me that there is urgent need for some amendatory legislation in advance of the completion of our study of the entire problem and the submission of a full report of our labors for the last 2 years. I have already introduced a bill (S. 1832) on the substantive provisions of the law relating to the exclusion of subversives. However, no provision of law that the Congress could write will solve the problem if the organizational set-up for its administration and enforcement is faulty.

The results of my inquiries and study have been sufficient to convince me that the officers and employees of the Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department of State are handicapped by a defective organization set-up. For many years both the Passport Division and the Visa Division of the Department of State functioned directly under an Assistant Secretary of State and maintained direct and continuous contact with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government, from which they obtained promptly and directly classified information relating to applicants for passports and visas. This information was analyzed by the experienced staffs and technicians of the Passport Division or of the Visa Division, depending upon whether the application was being made for a passport or for a visa, and the information was therefore brought directly to bear upon the decision reached on applications.

Mr. President, since the Judiciary Committee initiated its inquiries into the operational functioning of the Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department of State their long-established and direct contacts with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government have been abruptly terminated by directive of the higher officials in the Department of State. My information does not indicate that the abrupt termination of contacts between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other agencies of the Government and the Passport and Visa Divisions was effected at the request, or the wish, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or of any of the other agencies, such as the Central Intelligence Agency, the military or the naval intelligence services.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that this policy in the Department of State vitally affects our national and internal security. Can you imagine anyone in this day and time who is so oblivious to all considerations of our national security as to weaken the hands of those officers and employees of our Government who are trying to enforce the provisions of our law which exclude subversive aliens from this country? If the Kremlin had ordered this termination of contacts between the Passport and Visa Divisions and the security and intelligence agencies it could be no less fatal to our security.

Mr. President, let me recite some of the incidents which apparently led to this abrupt termination of direct contacts between the Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department of State and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government. You will recall that officers of the Visa Division testified before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1948. One of these officers was reprimanded by his superiors in the Department of State for telling the subcommittee the facts, which have been amply confirmed in the testimony of that officer's own superiors and other officers of the Government. We have established beyond a doubt that he was correct in saying that many subversive aliens were infiltrating into the United States. The Department of State, however, pretending not to know the facts, appointed a special committee of three private citizens to examine into this question. They submitted a wholly unrealistic report in which they denied the facts which have since been amply proven to be true, although the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization was denied access to any of the files of the Government in this instance.

However, the committee of three private citizens must have been disturbed in their own minds regarding the accuracy of the contents of their report. They must have figured that some day the true facts would certainly become known. They therefore included in their report to the Secretary of State the following statement:

"Your committee believes that existing administrative procedures, and the legislation on which they are based, are sufficient. The committee is not satisfied that practices under the outline of procedures are satisfactorily coordinated. This subject will be discussed in a subsequent memorandum to you, embodying certain suggestions which have occurred to your committee in the course of its inquiries."

Mr. President, I have seen no person who is willing to say what the suggestions were that occurred to the three-man committee which reported to the Secretary of State. The officers of the Visa Division say that they have never seen any record of the suggestions and have no idea what the suggestions were. However, I think we have the answer now. It appears that the abrupt termination of the direct contacts between the Passport and Visa Divisions and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government occurred soon after the three-man committee submitted its report.

Now I do not wish to give the Members of the Senate the impression that the Passport and Visa Divisions do not receive any information whatever from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government. They do receive some information from these sources, but it now comes through an intermediate office, called the Division of Security in the Department of State. When asked whether they are furnished by the Division of Security with all information received by that Division from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other agencies bearing upon applicants for passports or visas the officers of the Passport and Visa Divisions could not answer. How would they know? If asked whether the information had been edited or excerpted before reaching the Passport and Visa Divisions, the answer of the officers of the Passport and Visa Divisions would be the same. How would they know?

Mr. President, I have outlined a situation which could be considerably elaborated upon, but I believe that it is more important at this time to think in terms of a remedy for the faulty organizational structure which precludes the long-established direct contact between the Passport and Visa Divisions and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security and intelligence agencies of the Government.

Under the bill I have introduced there will be created in the Department of State a Bureau of Passports and Visas. The Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department will be reorganized under the Director of that Bureau. The Director will be required by statute to maintain direct and continuous contact with

the Directors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, and with other security and intelligence agencies of the Government, as well as with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, to the end that every applicant for a passport or a visa may be adequately and expeditiously screened, insofar as it may be practicable to do so, before final action is taken on his application.

Mr. President, I have given some thought to the qualifications which should be required of the Director of the Bureau of Passports and Visas, and of the Chiefs of the Passport and Visa Divisions in that Bureau. Of course, the loyalty and ability of these officers should be beyond question. In view of what has happened I cannot be satisfied that the security of this country will be adequately protected from the infiltration of subversive and questionable persons unless we lay down in the law the requirements for appointment of the officers in charge of the Bureau and the divisions in it.

The Department of State took over the remaining functions and personnel of certain wartime agencies several years ago. The Federal Economic Administration, formerly Henry Wallace's Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Office of War Information formerly under Elmer Davis, the Lend-Lease Administration under Harry Hopkins, and the remnants of the Office of Strategic Services, were all taken over by the Department of State in a process of liquidation. Those who constitute the remnants of these liquidated agencies have been established in key posts in the Department of State. As they were trained to regard the Soviet Union as an ally instead of a cobelligerent it is quite naturally going to take some time for them to adjust themselves fully to the actual fact that Soviet communism is actually the enemy of the United States and of all free countries of the world.

Mr. President, to protect the internal security of the United States, I have introduced my bill to reorganize that part of the Department of State which is required to administer and enforce our immigration and nationality laws. I think a Bureau of Passports and Visas, organized to include the present Passport and Visa Divisions of the Department of State may accomplish the purpose.

SEVERANCE PAY TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL AND DISTRICT GOVERNMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3074) to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) each officer or employee (including employees paid on an hourly or piece rate basis and employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates) in the service of (1) the executive branch of the Government, including the field service of the Post Office Department, (2) a corporation wholly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, or (3) the municipal government of the District of Columbia, who is involuntarily separated from such service, on or after the effective date of this act, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, shall be paid, immediately upon separation from such service, a sum as provided for in section (1) of subsection (b) (hereinafter referred to as "severance pay") by the department or independent establishment of the Government, or by the department or agency of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, with which he was employed immediately prior to separation.

(b) Such severance pay shall be in an amount equal to 1 day's basic compensation at the rate such officer or employee was entitled to receive immediately prior to separation, multiplied by the number of whole calendar months of that period of continuous service performed by him immediately prior to separation, but such amount shall not exceed 90 days' basic compensation at such rate.

SEC. 2. This act shall not apply to—

(1) any such officer or employee who is subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, or any other retirement law or system, and, at the time of separation from such service, has fulfilled the requirements of optional or automatic retirement under such act of May 29, 1930, or such other retirement law or system; and

(2) any such officer or employee who is entitled to receive compensation under the Federal Employee's Compensation Act, as amended, except an officer or employee entitled to receive any benefits under such act on account of the death of any other person.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

This bill provides for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Officers and employees who are involuntarily separated from the service, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, shall be paid severance pay in an amount equal to one day's basic compensation for each whole calendar month of continuous service performed immediately prior to the employee's separation, not to exceed 90 days basic compensation, at the rate such officers or employees were entitled to receive immediately prior to separation.

Officers and employees who have fulfilled the requirements or who are entitled to receive compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act will not be eligible to receive severance pay under the provisions of this bill.

Federal employees at the present time are not covered by unemployment compensation or severance pay and this legislation when enacted into law will not cost very much but will protect those employees who are let out of the service by reduction in force.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by me explaining the meaning and purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3088) to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration from the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 624), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause, on his own motion or on the motion of interested producers or processors, an immediate investigation to be made by the appropriate office or agency of the United States Department of Agriculture responsible for the administration of the affected program, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the Secretary of Agriculture finds the existence of such facts, he shall certify to the President such facts and the President may by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere

with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the Secretary of Agriculture may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies to the President that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever the Secretary of Agriculture finds and certifies to the President that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Any decision, finding, or certification of facts and required fees or quantitative limitations of the Secretary of Agriculture under this section shall be final.

"(f) No international agreement hereafter shall be entered into by the United States, or renewed, extended, or allowed to extend beyond its permissible termination date in contravention of this section."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON EXPLAINING THE MEANING AND PURPOSE OF THE BILL AMENDING SECTION 22 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill amending section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The bill conforms generally to two amendments I introduced last October when the so-called Anderson farm bill was before us. Most Senators will recall the debate on those amendments—debate culminating in Senate approval of one, by a vote of 44 to 28.

Section 22 of the AAA Act was designed by its authors to provide a means of protecting domestic agricultural producers—under certain circumstances—from ruinous imports. Its machinery may be invoked through a proclamation by the President when imports threaten the efficacy of a marketing agreement, price support, school lunch, export subsidy, or similar farm program.

Section 22 has never been the effective safety valve its authors intended it to be. To the best of my knowledge, only two sets of domestic farm producers have ever been successful in obtaining the protection section 22 is designed to extend. The two sets of producers are growers of cotton and wheat. I have been unable to find a single case in which producers of a perishable agricultural commodity have been successful in obtaining action under section 22. Recent experience with imports dictates that the Congress either make section 22 an effective tool or write it off the books. There is no point in having a safety valve that doesn't work.

Since I argued this case here on the floor of the Senate in October, a number of incidents have occurred which demonstrate the soundness of the course of action I then implored the Congress to take. Let me cite two of them.

Last week newspapers throughout the country carried the story of Canadian potato imports. A shipload of Canadian potatoes reached New Orleans at a landed cost 10 to 15 cents per 100 pounds less than the support price on Maine potatoes in Maine. This is a repetition of what happened during the 1948 marketing season. During that period over 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes were imported from Canada at a time when this Nation was spending $200,000,000 to support the price to domestic growers.

I draw the second example from the experience of the apple industry. During fiscal 1949, apple imports amounted to about $5,750,000. During the identical period we exported apples valued at about $5,500,000. From the same crop we purchased for school lunches domestically grown apples valued at $4,500,000. It is obvious that school-lunch purchases from section 32 funds almost equaled the dollar value of apples imported.

I don't necessarily conclude that section 22 should have been invoked to stop these imports although many members of the industry urged such action. I do contend, however, that the machinery to deal with the situation should be sufficiently streamlined to permit such action should the facts so dictate.

This bill proposes a streamlining of section 22. Here's what the amendment does: First, it transfers the fact-finding function from the Tariff Commission to the Secretary of Agriculture; thus, the Secretary will conduct the investigation of the effect of imports upon agricultural programs such as marketing agreements, school-lunch purchases, price supports, export subsidies, and similar programs. Second, he will recommend action to the President based on the facts developed through his investigation. Third, if the President concurs in the Secretary's recommendations, he may by proclamation impose either an import fee up to 50 percent ad valorem, or place a limitation on the quantity that can be imported of the commodity involved.

Under this bill, the Tariff Commission would be relieved of the responsibilities now assigned to it under section 22. The line of action would run from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President, instead of as is now the case, the Secretary of Agriculture to the President—the President to the Tariff Commission—the Tariff Commission back to the President.

In my judgment this is justified. The Secretary of Agriculture is charged by Congress with heavy responsibilities in connection with domestic production—when price support or similar programs are in effect. He should have parallel authority over imports, because domestic production plus imports constitutes the over-all supply with which the Secretary has to deal.

The President may or may not concur in the Secretary's recommendations, but at least under section 22, as I propose to amend it, the Secretary's recommendations would stem from his parallel responsibility on the one hand over domestic production, and on the other over imports of commodities which threaten to render ineffective a marketing agreement, price support, or similar farm program.

In addition, the bill amends subsection (f) of section 22. That subsection was added by the Eightieth Congress. It reads:

"No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

I propose that the emphasis be reversed. The section should be amended to read:

"No international agreement hereafter shall be entered into by the United States or renewed, extended, or allowed to extend beyond its permissible termination date in contravention of this section."

The issue here is simple, namely, shall the protection to agricultural producers and programs provided in section 22 be abrogated by an international treaty or trade agreement? Or to put it another way, shall the United States Government on the one hand say to the farmers of this country, "We have provided a safety valve against excessive and injurious imports through the medium of section 22," but on the other say to our foreign friends, "The trade agreement we are negotiating with you nullifies the effect of section 22."

In conclusion, section 22 should be streamlined if it is to be the effective tool its authors intended it to be. Subsection (f) should be reworded or repealed if we are to be honest with the farmers and taxpayers of this country and with our foreign friends.

May I add a postscript—by way of general comment—on my attitude toward trade agreements as they relate to the bill I have just introduced. I have consistently supported trade-agreement legislation. I see no inconsistency between that action and what I am here proposing.

The United States of America has been catapulted into world leadership. Reciprocal trade agreements are one of the media through which we seek to exercise that leadership. We do this because we believe freer trade will promote a higher standard of living in the world and will make a substantial contribution to world peace.

Reciprocal trade agreements cannot be negotiated under utopian circumstances. We can be idealists and still recognize the hard facts as they exist. If we were starting our trade-agreement policy with a completely clean slate we could remove all barriers, thereby adding immeasurably to the effectiveness of our world leadership and at the same time avoid wreaking irreparable damage upon specific industries and, therefore, upon selected groups of our own citizens.

Unfortunately trade practices and national policies over the last 200 years have encouraged patriotic, industrious American citizens to invest their energies and finances in enterprises to which the death knell would be sounded if a system of complete free trade were instituted world-wide, as of tomorrow morning. The practicalities of the situation demand, therefore, that the Congress and the executive branch, particularly the State Department, approach reciprocal trade in the light of things as they are.

I am not too much disturbed by the repeated accusations on the part of industry that the concessions we grant—as the leading Nation of the world—exceed in value the concessions we receive. Such is the price we pay for world leadership. I am extremely disturbed, however, over the apparent failure on the part of our negotiators to balance the international good we expect will emanate from a concession granted by us; against the immediate or prospective damage such concessions will wreak upon a domestic industry—the immediate and prospective damage such concessions will wreak upon a minor segment of our population.

I do not want to see the United States play the role of Uncle Shylock. Neither do

I want to see our reciprocal trade program jeopardized by those ardent free-traders who fail to recognize that steps toward our ultimate objective must be taken in a world where existing industrial and economic patterns demand consideration.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF BULLETIN ENTITLED "OCCUPATIONAL OUTLOOK HANDBOOK"

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a bulletin entitled "Occupational Outlook Handbook," and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Utah will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Bulletin No. 940 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, entitled "Occupational Outlook Handbook," containing information on employment opportunities in occupations of interest to veterans and students, be printed as a Senate document, and that 3,300 additional copies be printed, of which 2,300 shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and that the Bureau of Labor Statistics be requested to keep the information in this publication up to date.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

The Occupational Outlook Handbook gives information on employment opportunities in the major occupations and industries. It is used in vocational counseling of veterans and young people in schools who are trying to choose a field of work. The Nation spends billions of dollars on education annually; the information in the handbook helps young people to plan their courses of education to train them for jobs in which they will be able to find employment.

The handbook has been widely acclaimed by educational authorities in State school systems and colleges throughout the Nation. In its preparation, the Department of Labor had the cordial cooperation of thousands of business firms, trade associations, professional societies, and trade-unions in the various industries and professional fields.

Many Members of Congress have received requests for copies from schools and colleges in their States, but these requests can no longer be handled by the Department of Labor because the small supply originally printed for Department use is completely exhausted. The handbook is available from the Superintendent of Documents for $1.75, and many schools and private individuals have purchased it from this source. However, a great many State school systems have been unable to afford even this modest cost to equip each school in the State with a copy.

The purpose of this resolution is to print a supply of the Occupational Outlook Handbook for the use of Members of Congress in meeting requests coming to them from schools, colleges, and other organizations in their States which provide vocational guidance services to young people and to veterans.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 75, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit certain amendments intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 75, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, as this is the last day on which amendments can be offered. If I were to make the statements necessary to explain the amendments, it would take a good part of the afternoon, and I do not desire to do that. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer the amendments, and have them printed in the body of the RECORD, together with explanatory statements respecting each amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the amendments and the statements referred to will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The amendments and statements are as follows:

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the outset of any discussion of the pending measure it should be clearly understood—and this fact should be borne in mind at all times—that whereas the title of the bill S. 75 speaks of "authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals," actually the main objective of the bill is to authorize the diversion of Colorado River water for an irrigation and reclamation project in central Arizona. It has been repeatedly pointed out, and correctly, that the Bridge Canyon Dam has no essential physical relationship with the central Arizona project. It is a means to that end, but not the only means; its usefulness in connection with the central Arizona project would be for the production of power to be used for pumping water nearly 1,000 feet high; and it has not been demonstrated that the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam would be the only possible source of such power. Indeed, it has not even been demonstrated, and it may be questioned whether it can be demonstrated that the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam would even be the cheapest source of such power.

This bill does contain authorization for construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam. It also contains various other authorizations and grants of authority, extremely broad in their nature. Indeed, in some respects the language of the bill is so vague that it is difficult to say just what it does authorize.

For example, the language contained in subparagraph (4) of section 1 (beginning on p. 2 of the bill, in line 22) and in subparagraph (4) of the same section (beginning on p. 3 of the bill, in line 3) is susceptible of being construed as a tremendous grant of power to the Secretary of the Interior. Construction of this legislative language, if enacted, will rest, in the first instance, with the Secretary of the Interior, and past experience leads us to believe that the language in question, under such circumstances, will not be narrowly construed.

The language of subparagraph (4) of section 1, referred to above, appears to embrace authority for the construction of steam plants for the generation of electrical energy without any limitation upon the number or capacity of such plants so long as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem such plants to be "incidental structures suitable for the fullest economical development of electrical energy generated from water at the works constructed hereunder." Senators will note the Secretary is not even required to find that steam plants are needed; he need only find that they are suitable. If it is not desired that the Secretary of the Interior be given authority to construct steam plants, this section of the bill should be amended, and I shall propose such an amendment when the proper time comes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

On page 2, in line 22, after the word "plants", insert the words: "(other than steam plants for the production of electrical energy)."

Mr. McCARRAN. Subparagraph (5) of section 1 is either very poorly worded, or very skillfully worded, depending upon whether it is intended to have any hidden effect. The language on page 3, beginning in line 4: "including interconnecting lines to effectuate coordination with other Federal projects" could be construed to refer to power transmission lines. I believe it would be so construed by the Secretary of the Interior. I believe it is intended that it shall be so construed. Under this language, so construed, the Secretary of the Interior would have blanket authority to construct a network of power transmission lines which would tie together the generators to be installed at the Bridge Canyon project, and those at Boulder Dam and at Davis Dam. He could even go further, and extend the interconnecting network to tie in the power production at the Shasta Dam in northern California. Construction of such a transmission line network has long been an objective of the Interior Department; and this bill, if enacted without amendment, could be deemed to give the authority for such construction, which has hitherto been denied by the Congress.

If there be those who say it would be a good thing to tie Boulder Dam power and Davis Dam power and Bridge Canyon Dam power together in a single system, so that power from Boulder Dam and Davis Dam might be supplemented with power from Bridge Canyon Dam, let me point out that there is nothing in the bill now pending before the Senate which would guarantee the accomplishment of that purpose. The objective of supplementing Boulder Dam power and Davis Dam power with power from Bridge Canyon Dam necessarily involves a flow of power from

Bridge Canyon Dam toward Boulder Dam and Davis Dam, and an allocation of Bridge Canyon power to be pooled with the power from Boulder Dam and Davis Dam. But power transmission lines work equally well in either direction; and it would be perfectly possible under the language of this bill, once such lines had been established connecting the three dams named, to turn the flow in the other direction, and take power from the Boulder Dam and Davis Dam projects, and allocate it for use or sale in connection with the Bridge Canyon project.

This would involve violation of contracts already in existence providing for the disposition of power from Boulder Dam; and in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, that is exactly what would happen.

On the basis of the estimates of power revenues, prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, it seems perfectly clear that the Bureau intends to "firm up" Bridge Canyon power by supplementing it with power produced at Boulder Dam. Furthermore, it seems perfectly clear that the Bureau intends to accomplish this by simply transferring and crediting Boulder Dam power to the Bridge Canyon project, and to do this without charging any of the cost of the Boulder Dam to the Bridge Canyon project. Such a plan necessarily entails a totally unwarranted invasion of the rights of those who have contracted for power from Boulder Dam. The rights of the State of Nevada to power from Boulder Dam are thus threatened, and that is a matter which greatly concerns the senior Senator from Nevada.

Such an extremely broad grant of authority for the construction of power transmission lines, which subparagraph (5) of section 1 of this bill might be construed to grant, is unjustifiable and indefensible. If that is the way the bill is intended to be construed, then the bill should be defeated. If that is not the way the bill is intended to be construed, then the bill should be amended; and in order to give the Senate an opportunity to express its will on this point, I shall offer an appropriate amendment at the proper time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

On page 3, in line 4, after the word "lines", insert the following: "(but in the case of power transmission lines, only when such lines have been specifically authorized by law and appropriations have been made therefor)."

Mr. McCARRAN. The last proviso in section 3 of this bill (on p. 6, beginning in line 7) would give the Secretary of the Interior the absolute discretion to fix the repayment period for costs of the project. The only limitation placed upon this discretion would be that the repayment period to be fixed by the Secretary should not exceed the useful life of the project. The question of how the Secretary determines the useful life of the project would be left to the Secretary. He would not be limited to the period within which it is probable the reservoir to be created by this dam would be entirely filled with silt. That might be anywhere from 30 to 50 years, depending on whether Bluff Dam is constructed; and remember, the construction of Bluff Dam is prohibited under the Watkins amendment, which was adopted by the committee, and which consists of the matter in italics beginning on page 3 in line 20. In its estimates, the Bureau of Reclamation has talked about a 70-year repayment period; but there is nothing in the bill which would limit the repayment to 70 years. As a matter of fact, it seems perfectly clear that the project cost could not be repaid in 70 years, and that undoubtedly some longer period will be necessary. The Secretary of the Interior could make that period 100 years, or 150 years, or 500 years. I do not mean to be facetious, but there is nothing in this proposed law which would prevent the Secretary of the Interior from determining that the dam had a useful life of 1,000 years, or 2,000 years, and making the repayment period 10 centuries or more. I do not say that he would do it, but he could do it under the language of this bill. Furthermore, this bill applies the reclamation laws with regard to repayment, which means that during the entire period of repayment, whether it is 70 years, or 100 years, or 500 years, or whatever it is, no interest is to be charged on the construction cost. There may be good justification for such a provision in the case of a project which is to be repayable within 50 years, as the present reclamation law provides, but there is very little, if any, justification for it in the case of a repayment period which may be 2, or 3, or 10 times the period now provided for in the reclamation law. Here, again, the bill needs amendment, and I shall offer an amendment at the proper time.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

On page 6, in line 10, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert "with due regard for the probable reduction in capacity of the Bridge Canyon Reservoir by reason of silting, but not to exceed 70 years regardless of such determination."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it has already been pointed out that the Bridge Canyon Dam is in no way peculiarly a part of the central Arizona project, and it is certainly true that the central Arizona project is in no way necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Bridge Canyon Dam. The Bridge Canyon Dam and central Arizona project are tied together in this bill because the construction of the dam will provide one means of generating the huge amounts of power necessary for the successful accomplishment of the central Arizona project. Personally the senior Senator from Nevada would much prefer, and believes that other Senators would much prefer, to see the Bridge Canyon Dam constructed as a separate entity. However, this bill as it now stands does provide for tying the Bridge Canyon Dam and the central Arizona project together, and it earmarks approximately one-third of the power to be generated at the Bridge Canyon Dam to be diverted for the uses and purposes of the central Arizona project. If that is to be done, Mr. President, it seems only right and fair that the rights of other States to the remaining power should be adequately protected. Accordingly, Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment at the appropriate time providing that all of this remaining power shall be divided equally among the States of California, Nevada, and Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

On page 6, line 14, beginning with the word "sold," strike out all to and including the word "act," in line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "for distribution in equal parts in the States of California, Nevada, and Utah."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it has already been pointed out in this Chamber repeatedly during debate that this bill contains provisions for unprecedented Federal subsidies amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. The amount which is used in the minority report, and which is referred to as an outright gift, is $850,000,000. If we are to authorize subsidies on any such scale—or, for that matter, if we are to authorize subsidies at all—we should write into the bill the strongest provisions we can to guarantee against land speculation or the unjust enrichment of those, if any there be, who may already have speculated in land in contemplation of the possible enactment of this measure. Fortunately we have a precedent in this regard, for provisions of this nature were written into the law when Congress authorized the reclamation of a large area in the Columbia Valley in connection with the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam. I propose to offer an amendment to this bill, following the lines of that precedent, which will remove incentive for speculation in the lands proposed to be irrigated under the project which this bill would authorize, and which will, to some extent at least, guard against unjust enrichment of any owners of such lands.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

On page 7, line 9, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following provisos: *"Provided,* That every such contract shall require that all irrigable land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of 40 irrigable acres and all county and State lands which may be irrigated under the said project shall be designated as excess land and as such shall not be entitled to receive water from said project. The contract shall provide further that no owner of such excess lands in the said project shall receive water therefrom for any part of the land owned by him if and so long as he shall refuse to sell any excess lands owned or held by him under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and at prices fixed in the appraisals made and approved as herein provided. The Secretary of the Interior may require each landowner, as a condition precedent to receiving water from the said irrigation works, to execute a valid recordable contract wherein he shall agree to dispose of excess holdings then or thereafter owned by him in the manner provided in the contract between his district and the United States, and wherein the said landowner also shall confer upon the Secretary of the Interior an irrevocable power of attorney to make any such sale on his behalf. For the purpose of determining excess lands under the provisions of this section husband and wife shall be considered separate persons and each may hold not to exceed 40 irrigable acres as nonexcess lands or husband and wife together may hold 80 irrigable acres of community property as such nonexcess lands: *Provided further,* That in addition to the foregoing provisions, every such contract with any district shall also provide, with respect to all irrigable lands whether initially excess or nonexcess, that whenever any land is sold at a price in excess of the sum of the appraised value of the arid land, as determined by the Secretary, the appraised value of improvements made thereon after the date of the original appraisal, and the amount of irrigation construction costs actually paid for that land, then, before the new owner shall be entitled to receive water from the project, a proportionate part of the said excess or incremented value shall be paid to the United States as follows: If such payment is made to the United States more than 50 months after such sale at an excessive price has been made, then as a prerequisite to the right to receive water all of the incremented value shall be paid to the United States to apply on construction installments to come due on such land in inverse order of their accrual; if payment is made in less than 50 months but more that 49 months after the date of such sale, then 99 percent of such incremented value or excess of sale price shall be thus paid and applied; if payment is made in less than 49 but more than 48 months after the date of such sale, then 98 percent of such incremented value or excess of sale price shall be thus paid and applied, and so on for earlier payment allowing an additional reduction of 1 percent for each month, so that in the event that such payment is made to the United States within 1 month after the date of such sale, then the percentage of the incremented value required to be paid to the United States for application to construction costs as a prerequisite to the right to receive water shall be 50 percent thereof."

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee amendment to the bill contained in section 12, beginning on page 9, line 16, purports to accomplish the purposes of Senate Joint Resolution 4, by authorizing an original action in the Supreme Court to adjudicate claims of right to the use of waters of the Colorado River; and the succeeding section, which is section 13, also a committee amendment, purports to provide a measure of protection by deferring the construction of works required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona until after water rights have been adjudicated under the provisions of section 12. There is grave doubt, however, whether the committee amendments actually do what they purport to do in this regard.

Section 12 contains no provision protecting the adjudication of Colorado River water rights by the Supreme Court, for which that section purports to provide, from being affected by other provisions of this proposed legislation. Since this whole measure will become law at the same instant, the act will necessarily be effective before any action can be brought under the provisions of section 12; therefore, section 12 should contain some safeguard against the possibility that this new law itself might be construed as limiting or coercing the action of the Supreme Court in adjudicating Colorado River water rights.

In connection with this danger, which I have pointed out, that the very enactment of this legislation might itself have a bearing on the adjudications of the Supreme Court with regard to Colorado River water rights, it is also necessary that sections 8 and 9 of the bill be amended, so as to make it perfectly clear that the Colorado River contract, the water-delivery contract between the United States and the State of Arizona dated February 9, 1944, the Mexican water treaty signed February 3, 1944, the protocol thereto dated November 14, 1944, and the understanding recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, are to be controlling as construed by the Supreme Court through the adjudication contemplated in section 12.

Accordingly, I propose to offer amendments to sections 8 and 9 at the appropriate time.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

On page 8, ine 16, strike out the period, and add the following: "other than as they may be construed, modified, or affected by an adjudication of the Supreme Court under section 12 of this act."

AMENDMENT NO. 7

On page 8, line 25, strike out the period, and add the following: "other than as they may be construed, modified, or affected by an adjudication of the Supreme Court under section 12 of this act."

Mr. McCARRAN. During the debate on this bill, and, indeed, for a long time before this bill was introduced, there has been substantial controversy over the rights of the State of Nevada, and the rights of other States, to the use of water from the Colorado River. It has been the consistent contention of the State of Nevada, and of the senior Senator from Nevada, that under existing law, the State of Nevada is entitled absolutely to 300,000 acre-feet of water annually from Mead Lake, primarily for the production of power at Boulder Dam. Other States have made other claims, but I shall confine myself at this point to the claim of the State of Nevada. It has been stated, most irresponsibly, that Nevada has no such right to water from Mead Lake. The senior Senator from Nevada is not content that this bill should be enacted without protecting Nevada's right to water from Mead Lake.

I propose to offer an amendment to this bill, at the proper time, which will confirm Nevada's right to Mead Lake water. Because the 300,000 acre-feet per year to which Nevada is now legally entitled, under existing law, is by no means the full amount of water to which the State of Nevada has an equitable claim, the amendment which I shall propose will specify 1,000,000 acre-feet of water per year. I anticipate that other Senators, from other States, may wish to have this amendment modified so as to give protection to the claims of their respective States; and I shall be glad to entertain suggestions to that end, and to discuss the matter, either here on the floor, or privately, with Senators who are interested.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

On page 9, beginning with line 11, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following proviso: *"Provided,* That any appropriation, control, or use shall be subject to the right of the State of Nevada to withdraw from Lake Mead 1,000,000 acre-feet of water per annum."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I referred a moment ago to the fact that section 12 of the bill before us is deficient because it contains no provision which will protect the Supreme Court, in its adjudication of actions brought under authority of this section, from the possible argument that Congress, by enacting other provisions of this very bill, has determined at least some of the issues involved. As I said before, section 12 should contain some safeguard against the possibility that this new law itself might be construed as limiting or coercing the action of the Supreme Court in adjudicating Colorado River water rights. Accordingly, I propose to offer an amendment on this point. This amendment, which complements the amendments, I propose to offer to sections 8 and 9.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

On page 9, beginning with line 16, strike out all to and including line 13, page 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12. If any State or States within 6 months after the effective date of this Act shall begin a suit or suits in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the right to the use of water for diversion from the main stream of the Colorado River through aqueducts or tunnels to be constructed pursuant to this act for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona, and to adjudicate claims of right asserted by such State or States or by any other State or States, based on any applicable compact, statute, priority, or treaty, consent is hereby given to the joinder of the United States of America as a party in such action or actions. Any State of the Colorado River Basin may intervene or be impleaded in such suit or suits. Any such claims of right affected by the project herein authorized and asserted by any defendant State, impleaded State, or intervening State under any compact, statute, priority, or treaty, or by the United States may be adjudicated in such action. In any such suit or suits process directed against the United States shall be served upon the Attorney General of the United States."

Mr. McCARRAN. Section 13 of the bill refers, on page 10, beginning in line 19, to "works authorized by this act which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona." There may be some question whether this language includes the aqueduct from Lake Havasu to and connecting with the main canal and the pumping plants to raise water from Lake Havasu, which are authorized in section 1 of the bill. Certainly there should not be any such question, for it is obvious that these works are intended to be included in the language quoted. As a matter of fact, they are the primary works which are intended to be so included. But I say there "may be" some question whether they are included because the language of section 1, on page 4, does not in terms provide that these works are to be "solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona." What section 1 says, on page 4, is that these works are to be authorized "in order to provide a means of diversion of water from the Colorado River to the main canal pending the construction of said tunnel and said portion of the canal and"—now mark this language—"and for use thereafter as supplemental and stand-by works." I cannot conceive what use the Secretary of the Interior might decide to make of the aqueduct and the pumping plants except "for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona"; but if such other use can be found, however inappropriate and uneconomical it might be, the Secretary of the Interior would be in a position to contend that the works in question are not comprehended within the language of section 13. In fact, it might even be argued that, since section 1 contemplates that the canal and the pumping plants shall be used at some future time as "stand-by works," this means that they are not to be used solely and forever "for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona," and therefore that the works in question are not comprehended in the language of section 13.

Since it is clearly the intent that the construction of the canal and the pumping plants shall be deferred, pursuant to the provisions of section 13, until the adjudication of any suit or suits which may be brought under the provisions of section 12, and since it can do no possible harm to guard against a possible undesirable construction of the law, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment which will leave no possible room for any construction different from the construction intended by the Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

On page 10, line 19, after the word "act", insert the following: "(including, but not by way of limitation, the aqueduct from Lake Havasu to and connecting with the main canal in the vicinity of Cunningham Wash, and the pumping plants to raise water from Lake Havasu authorized in section 1 hereof)."

Mr. McCARRAN. Section 13 of this bill is also poorly drafted in another respect. It purports to defer construction of certain works during the pendency of any action brought under section 12; but it would permit the period of deferral to end as soon as the court has handed down its opinion in the last of any suits so filed. This is a reasonable result only if the Court's decision gives Arizona enough water to make the central Arizona project feasible. Obviously, if the Court decides that Arizona does not have the right to enough water to make the project feasible, then the construction of works solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona should either be deferred indefinitely, until the plan can be revised in line with the Court's decision, or should not be authorized at all.

The report of the Bureau of Reclamation shows that the central Arizona project, as now designed, will require a water supply of approximately 1,200,000 acre-feet per year. Adoption of the amendment which I now send forward would mean that if the final adjudication of the Supreme Court shows an

available water supply materially less than 1,200,000 acre-feet per year, the project would be halted until it could be redesigned, and reauthorized by the Congress, to fit the available water supply, whatever that may be.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

On page 11, line 1, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or in the event that final adjudication by the Supreme Court of any and all suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in section 12 of this act fails to confirm the right of Arizona to an adequate and dependable supply of water from the main stream of the Colorado River for the irrigation and reclamation uses within Arizona contemplated by this act."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendments which I propose to offer, and which I have discussed here, are not suggested, and will not be offered, for any captious, or dilatory, or obstructive purpose. The sole purpose of these amendments is to improve the bill, to guard against possible improper construction at some future time, and to erect safeguards which fairness and equity dictate. There is a reason for each of these amendments, and I have stated those reasons. I am not sure, Mr. President, whether I can bring myself to vote for this bill in any event; but so long as there is any chance that this measure may be enacted by the Congress, I feel it my duty to seek to perfect the bill in every possible way, because the interests of the State of Nevada, which I have the honor to represent in this honorable body, are vitally concerned. I earnestly hope that any Senators who were not able to be present today to hear my explanation of these amendments will study the record, and familiarize themselves with the amendments between now and the date fixed for voting upon this bill.

BROTHERHOOD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY AT INTERDENOMINATIONAL BROTHERHOOD MEETING

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Brotherhood," delivered by him before an interdenominational Brotherhood Meeting at the Synagogue of the Congregation B'nai Israel, of Elizabeth, N. J., on February 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY, WORLD DISARMAMENT, AND REVISION OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a statement issued by him on February 19, 1950, together with a letter addressed by him to the Secretary of State, urging the State Department to request a poll of the United Nations regarding a new international conference on control of atomic energy, world disarmament, and revision of United Nations Charter, which appear in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE LODGE

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Lincoln Day address delivered by Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, before the New Haven Republican Organizations' annual Lincoln Day dinner, February 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROTHERHOOD IN AMERICA—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brotherhood in America," published in the New York Times of February 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI BASIN—ADDRESS BY W. G. SLOAN

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by W. G. Sloan, chairman, Missouri Basin field committee, before the thirty-first annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY PROBLEMS IN THE PACIFIC—ADDRESS BY GEN. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gen. William J. Donovan on the occasion of the presentation to him by Columbia University of the Alexander Hamilton award, at the Ritz Carlton Hotel, New York City, on February 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEADERSHIP IN ASIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Leadership in Asia," published in the New York Herald Tribune for February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF COAL SUPPLIES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, chapter 15 of the laws of 1950, State of New York, the text of "An act providing emergency measures for the control of coal supplies," approved by Governor Dewey on February 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIOGRAPHY OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a short biography of Susan B. Anthony, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT SPUD MUDDLE—LETTER FROM GEORGE B. BUCK

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to the Belfast (Maine) Republican Journal by George B. Buck, relative to the potato situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

POTATOES, POLITICIANS, AND ATOM BOMBS: AROOSTOOK COUNTY HAS DONE ITS JOB WELL—EDITORIAL FROM THE BANGOR (MAINE) COMMERCIAL

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Potatoes, Politicians, and Atom Bombs: Aroostook County Has Done Its Job Well," published in the Bangor (Maine) Commercial of February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROTHERHOOD WEEK—ADDRESS BY JOSEPH J. MORROW

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Prejudice: A Moral Problem," delivered by Joseph J. Morrow, personnel manager, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Conn., before the Catholic Interracial Council of New York, on November 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISTORY OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE CARABAO

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the history of the Military Order of the Carabao, written by Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs, USNR, for the 1939 Wallow, and printed in the Army and Navy Journal of February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW GRAND PARAMOUNT CARABAO—ARTICLE FROM THE ARMY AND NAVY JOURNAL

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The New Grand Paramount Carabao," written by Carabao Robert Sherrod and published in the Army and Navy Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPENSIVE "WILDCATS"—EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Expensive 'Wildcats'," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

"HOUSING" IS A MISNOMER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "'Housing' Is a Misnomer," published in the New York Times of February 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE CHINESE TRAGEDY—COMMENTARY BY W. EARL HALL

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio commentary entitled "America's Role in the Chinese Tragedy," by W. Earl Hall, managing editor of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, published in the Mason City Globe-Gazette for February 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PORTRAIT OF A STATESMAN—ARTICLE BY "REV. A. S. TURNIPSEED"

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Portrait of a Statesman," written under the pen name of "Rev. A. S. Turnipseed," published in the Montgomery (Ala.) Examiner for February 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE LIQUOR ADVERTISEMENTS

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Hon. Harlan M. Calhoun, of Moorefield, W. Va., in regard to Senate bill 1847 prohibiting interstate liquor advertisements, which appears in the Appendix.]

YOUTH RALLY ATTRACTS 2,000 WHITE AND NEGRO STUDENTS—ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Youth Rally Attracts 2,000 White and Negro Students," published in the Baltimore Morning Sun, Saturday, February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUDICIAL LEGISLATION: A THREAT TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BRICKER

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Judicial Legislation: A Threat to Constitutional Government," delivered by Senator BRICKER on February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

IT'S FUN TO SPEAK YOUR PIECE, TOO

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a folder entitled "It's Fun To Speak Your Piece, Too," which appears in the Appendix.]

BIWEEKLY BROADCASTS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain biweekly broadcasts made by him during the month of February 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

SHOULD UTAH-IDAHO POTATO GROWER BE FARM SUPPORT "WHIPPING BOY"?—EDITORIAL FROM THE DESERET (UTAH) NEWS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Deseret (Utah) News of February 15, 1950, entitled "Should Utah-Idaho Potato Grower Be Farm Support 'Whipping Boy' "? which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture dealing with the authority of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other officials of the executive branch to control imports and exports of agricultural commodities, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING LOANS—TELEGRAM FROM D. T. KIMBROUGH

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Mr. D. T. Kimbrough, Jr., president of the Home Builders Association of Memphis, Tenn., concerning Senate bill 2246, which has to do with housing. I ask that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEMPHIS, TENN., *February 17, 1950.*

Hon. K. D. McKELLAR,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our home-building industry in Memphis produced over 6,000 homes here in 1949 under our free-enterprise system. This $36,000,000 per year industry has housed better than 70,000 Memphians and Shelby Countians in the four postwar years. As president of our association representing 150 home builders and associates, I respectfully urge you to direct your attention to Senate bill S. 2246 to come up for consideration on the floor of the Senate. We specifically ask your opposition to the following provisions which we feel are detrimental to the home-building industry: One, we are unalterably opposed to title 3 of S. 2246 establishing cooperative housing with 3 percent loans for a 50- to 60-year period. Two, we are opposed to the provision providing three hundred million in direct Treasury loans through the VA. Three, we strongly oppose the elimination of 505 (A) VA-FHA combination loans and vigorously oppose the provision transferring more than 32,000 permanent Lanham Act housing units to local public housing authorities. We urge your support of provisions for the permissible mortgage limit of $7,600. Under section 203 (B) (2) (D) as now called for by the House bill and urge increasing the Federal National Mortgage Association appropriation by at least $1,000,000,000. We humbly ask your support of our position related to the amendments hereinabove.

D. T. KIMBROUGH,
President Home Builders Association of Memphis.

ALICE'S UNCLE IN BUREAU LAND—STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOWNEY

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, without reading, a statement of my own, entitled "Alice's Uncle in Bureau Land."

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

ALICE'S UNCLE IN BUREAU LAND

(Mr. Ant, president of the Association of National Taxpayers, discusses the central Arizona project with Michael Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation)

(By SHERIDAN DOWNEY)

"Good morning, Mr. Straus. I can see that you are deep in a whirlpool of nonreimbursables," said the visitor.

Mr. Straus growled without looking up from his figuring. "Somebody around here has to find ways to make infeasibles look more like feasibles."

"I might agree, if I were you," said the visitor diplomatically. "As I understand it, you are planning to have the people spend $33,000,000 to recreate on the central Arizona project so you can charge the Treasury that much."

"Well?" glared Mr. Straus. "What's wrong with that?"

The visitor swallowed hard. "Let me introduce myself. I am the president of the Association of National Taxpayers * * * the ANTS, as we are known. Ha, ha, the hardworkers of the Nation. Just call me Mr. Ant."

Mr. Straus sat up straight, a gleam of hope in his eyes. "ANTS," he cried. "Ant control. How much do you suppose we could write off a reclamation project for ant control?"

"Probably you could write off a lot," said Mr. Ant. "If I may say so, you are very efficient at such work."

Mr. Straus smiled. "We have a good writing-off staff."

"Indeed," said Mr. Ant. "Especially with such things as fish and mountain lions and coyotes. I'm not forgetting recreation. My, but you are good at writing off project costs for recreation. And then there is interest. I expect there is no one in the country better at getting money out of the treasury without interest than you."

Mr. Straus waved a hand as if to dismiss the thought. "Oh, we seldom pay any interest for Federal money. We leave that to you people—the ANTS, isn't it?"

Mr. Ant put his umbrella and old battered hat on the floor beside his chair and sighed. "These are matters I'd like to discuss with you at length some time. Unfortunately I'm in a hurry this morning. I have to see some Senators about the central Arizona project, and——"

"Don't waste breath." Mr. Straus almost yelled. "That project is all written off. The Treasury will get nothing——"

Mr. Ant swallowed so hard that Mr. Straus stopped speaking. There was an awkward silence, during which Mr. Straus grabbed his pencil and wrote off a million dollars from a Colorado project.

Mr. Ant regained his voice. "As I'm in a mood to pay a compliment," he said, "I may as well tell you that for sheer genius the write-offs of the central Arizona project are without equal."

"We'll do better," murmured Mr. Straus.

"It was a masterful performance," Mr. Ant went on. "As a taxpayer I would give anything. * * * I have left * * * to learn how you arrived at this peak of perfection. No one but a pure fiscal artist could have thought up such clever ways to keep the Treasury from being reimbursed. It's financial confusion of the highest order."

"You are too kind," Mr. Straus still murmured.

"Not at all," said Mr. Ant with some vehemence. "I believe you have written off at least $73,000,000 for fish propagation and recreation and such things. That's a world's record."

Mr. Straus only smiled, as if he was well aware of the fact.

"But the interest which the Treasury loses," Mr. Ant said with rising admiration. "It's inconceivable. If my figures are correct, the Treasury will lose more than a billion dollars in interest alone."

Mr. Straus frowned as if he were displeased. "Well, we had hoped to get more than that out of the Treasury, but there was a slight slip somewhere, I guess. The project only costs one and a half billions to build."

"And that's not paid back, either," said Mr. Ant with short breath.

"We're not in the paying-back business," Mr. Straus said firmly. "My point is, that we ought to be able to lose the Treasury more interest on such an amount than a mere billion."

"Your ambition overwhelms me," said Mr. Ant. He controlled his emotion. "You say that recreation benefits of the project are worth thirty-two million to the people. How do you decide that?"

"Recreation is a great thing," said Mr. Straus.

"If you can get it," said Mr. Ant.

"We get it," said Mr. Straus. "Now, just think. We propose to build a great dam at Bridge Canyon for the central Arizona project. Bridge Canyon is one of the most awe-inspiring places on earth, and the most bleak. Nothing but burning desert all around it. A prairie dog wouldn't bury his mother-in-law there."

"Fine place for recreation," commented Mr. Ant. "Correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought the President vetoed reclamation projects with recreation benefits."

"Oh, well, he did," admitted Mr. Straus. "But he doesn't understand these things yet."

"Maybe I'm the same as the President, in that respect," said Mr. Ant. "Do you suppose you could explain it to me?"

"Do you have to have everything explained?" growled Mr. Straus.

"I'm only asking," answered Mr. Ant meekly.

"Well," said Mr. Straus as if he were talking to an inferior, "it's like this. Please pay attention. We believe that benefits to the Nation from recreation in this ghastly desert place are as follows: $687,600 for travel value, and * * *"

"Horse and buggy?" asked Mr. Ant. "There are no roads there."

"Somebody will have to build roads," snapped Mr. Straus. "Travel value is based on our belief that 500,000 people will go to Bridge Canyon each year."

"What for?" asked Mr. Ant.

"To travel," said Mr. Straus. "And the travel value is what they spend to get there."

"Suppose they go some place else," suggested Mr. Ant.

"For heaven sake, stop interrupting," said Mr. Straus.

"I'm sorry," said Mr. Ant. "But what is the theory of travel benefit?"

"The greater the distance, the greater the benefit," said Mr. Straus. "Now, if this theory is applied to projects in general, it comes clear. If it's twice as far to one project as to another, the first project would have twice as much written off for travel benefit as the second. Is that plain?"

"Very," said Mr. Ant, and wiped his glasses.

Mr. Straus seemed satisfied. "Now we come to per diem value. That amounts to $660,000 a year for Bridge Canyon."

"Per diem for whom?" said Mr. Ant fearfully.

"Listen to him," scoffed Mr. Straus. "We figure that 20 percent of the visitors will stay one night, and 5 percent will stay longer."

"Where will they stay? Will there be hotels?" asked Mr. Ant.

"Somebody has to build a hotel," said Mr. Straus, and went right on. "That makes a total of 150,000 visitors, and each * * *."

"I thought there would be 500,000 visitors * * *." Mr. Ant began.

"For goodness' sake, let me finish," said Mr. Straus crossly. "Each will spend $4.40, or a total of $660,000 a year. There you have the per diem value."

Mr. Ant looked a little dizzy.

"Now we come to recreational value," Mr. Straus continued. "We figure this is about 20 cents each."

"Twenty cents," repeated Mr. Ant. "These aren't very high-class visitors, eh?"

Mr. Straus glared at him. "Leave class out of this. Recreational value at 20 cents each amounts to $100,000 a year. So * * * now we come to general value, and that's worth $269,000 a year. We arrive at this amount by figuring that general value is made up of 20 percent of travel value plus 20 percent of per diem value. Altogether that makes about $1,700,000 a year. Then you simply figure that over a 70-year period, which is the amortization period of Bridge Canyon Dam. That comes out $33,000,000."

"Who does it come out of?" asked Mr. Ant. His mouth was dry, but he managed to speak. "That's what the Treasury pays out for recreation at Bridge Canyon, the desert waste where there are no accommodations, no roads, no hamburger stands * * * only a few coyotes and prairie dogs."

"Don't be petty," said Mr. Straus critically. "What's the Treasury for?"

"I'm beginning to wonder," Mr. Ant said frankly.

Mr. Straus' face brightened. "But I haven't told you about the fish yet. Boy, fish are wonderful things for write-offs."

"What kind of fish?" Mr. Ant asked, somewhat recovering his sense of reasoning.

Mr. Straus waved his arms. "Fish, fish, gentle fish. Who cares? In a write-off a fish is a fish. We wrote off about three million for fish for Bridge Canyon Dam."

"They may not like it," suggested Mr. Ant.

"Never mind that," said Mr. Straus. "We like it. There will be a lake behind the dam, you know. The people who come there to recreate will catch fish."

"Three million dollars worth?" asked Mr. Ant. "That would be good fishing. But maybe they won't like to fish?"

"They have to like it," said Mr. Straus with finality.

"Maybe the people would rather go someplace else," said Mr. Ant.

"They won't be allowed to," said Mr. Straus, pounding his desk. "Look here, don't you start to sabotage this scheme. This is a benefit to the Nation."

Mr. Ant appeared to have found new courage. "I was just thinking that if the people didn't go to Bridge Canyon Dam to spend their money they might spend it someplace else, or they might buy shoes, or maybe cigars, and that would be a national benefit, too."

"Rubbish," scoffed Mr. Straus.

"Well," said Mr. Ant. "Something is bothering me. You say the fish are worth three million in the lake. How do you figure how many fish will be in the lake if they are not all caught?"

"More rubbish," said Mr. Straus. "We figured how many fish will be in the top foot of water. That's conservative figuring. We know that these fish will be worth about 50 cents a pound. There you have your total."

"You mean if a visitor catches a fish he can sell it to the Government and get his money back?" asked Mr. Ant.

Mr. Straus jumped up. "I've had enough of this nonsense," he roared. "Here we are trying to benefit the Nation, and you'd think we were trying to swipe $2,000,000,000 from the Treasury, to hear you talk. You taxpayers make me sick."

Mr. Ant looked sick. "I must be going," he said weakly. "I just reminded myself that the central Arizona project takes a couple of billion dollars from the Treasury and doesn't pay it back."

"Ha, ha," laughed Mr. Straus. "Maybe you'd like to talk about the billion dollars in interest the Treasury doesn't get back. That's really something." He grabbed up a pencil. "Look, let me explain about the interest——"

But Mr. Ant, his face white with horror, had grabbed up his hat and umbrella and was staggering out the door.

DEATH OF J. C. NICHOLS, OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 1 minute.

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

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, this country lost a great public-spirited citizen when J. C. Nichols, of Kansas City, Mo., died on February 16.

Mr. Nichols was one of the leading community developers in the United States. He was a unique combination of a man of vision and a man of action. The Country Club district in Kansas City, which he planned and developed, is world famous. There are few cities of large size in this country that in one way or another have not felt his genius. The physical aspect of many of them has been changed through the influence of his ideas.

Mr. Nichols contributed to the planning of the city of Washington as it is today. Its beauty, efficiency, and orderly arrangement is in no small measure due to his skill and foresight. He served as a member of the National Park and Planning Commission for 22 years. He was appointed to the Commission in 1926 by President Coolidge. His tenure of service continued through the administrations of Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman. During this time Mr. Nichols made approximately 150 trips from his home in Kansas City to Washington. Like the other members of the Commission, this was without pecuniary compensation.

I believe it is fitting that the unselfish service to his country of this able and patriotic citizen be made a matter of public record in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, Kansas lost one of its outstanding native sons in the death of J. C. Nichols February 16, 1950.

Born in Olathe, Kans., in 1880 and educated in Kansas schools, he became one of the leading citizens of Greater Kansas City. He had as much to do with the progressive development and growth of Kansas City as any other man.

The Country Club district of Kansas City is one of the outstanding examples of city planning in the United States. For many years Mr. Nichols was engaged in the creation in Greater Kansas City of perhaps the most beautiful and modern residential district in America. The Country Club Plaza district is one of the monuments to the accomplishments of this great man.

Mr. Nichols received national recognition by his appointment to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, a position he held for 22 years. He was often called the father of city planning in the West.

His death brought to a close a full, active, and useful life. It is fitting that we pay tribute to this great citizen of Kansas, Missouri, and the Nation. He was truly a national figure.

SOCIAL SECURITY VERSUS RAILROAD RETIREMENT MONTHLY BENEFITS—A COMPARISON

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few days ago I inserted in the RECORD two tabulations comparing certain aspects of the social-security and railroad-retirement plans. I would now like to have inserted another tabulation entitled "Exhibit C," presenting some further comparison between the benefits to be provided under these two retirement systems.

It is important to remember that railroad employees pay out 6 percent of their wages to secure the benefits provided under the Railroad Retirement Act, whereas employees covered by social security at present pay only 1½ percent and even under the proposed rising scale of tax rates will never pay more than 3¼ percent. In other words, railroad employees today pay four times as much and in the future will always pay twice as much. They receive benefits which are generally less than those under the provisions of the proposed revision of the social-security system.

From these figures it is obvious to me that either railroad employees pay too much or social-security employees pay too little, or else the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act are too small or the benefits under the Social Security Act are too large. I do not know which, but I certainly believe we have a responsibility to bring tax rates and benefits under the two systems more nearly in line.

EXHIBIT C.—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly benefits—a comparison*

	Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000, social security proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Maximum retirement benefits possible:			
For old age	$45.60	$64.40	$144.00
Wives	22.80	32.20	0
Husband and wife	68.40	96.60	0
Dependent child	22.80	32.20	0
Total	(91.20)	128.80	144.00
Maximum	85.00	150.00	144.00
Average retirement benefits:			
For old age	26.00	46.30	84.28
Wives	13.00	23.15	0
Husband and wife	39.00	69.45	0
Dependent child	13.00	23.15	0
Total	52.00	(92.60)	84.28
Maximum	-------	78.00	-------
Maximum survivor benefits possible:			
Aged widows	34.20	48.30	40.61
Widows with children	34.20	48.30	40.61
Children	22.80	48.30	27.08
Total	57.00	96.60	67.69
Maximum	85.00	150.00	108.30
Parents	22.80	48.30	27.08
Average survivor benefits:			
Aged widows	20.62	37.40	29.27
Widows with children	20.83	37.40	26.85
Children	13.03	28.70	16.60
Parents	13.64	28.70	15.98

EXHIBIT C.—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly benefits—a comparison*—Continued

	Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000, social security proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Credit for military service performed during World War II	None	$160.00	$160.00
Disability insurance benefits	None	(1)	(1)
Amount a beneficiary may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits	$14.99	50.00	25.00
Maximum monthly retirement annuity awarded at age 65 after 5 years of coverage	42.00	72.00	24.00

[1] Permanent and total disability.

Source: Rail Pension News, published by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Pl., Chicago 43, Ill.

The above exhibit C has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committee now holding hearings on H. R. 6000 for their study and consideration that rail workers should receive the same ratio of increases in benefits now proposed or those covered by social security and has been submitted by Mr. Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers) February 1950.

BORING FROM WITHIN—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA (NEBR.) WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Boring From Within," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of February 5, 1950.

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

BORING FROM WITHIN

Recent events suggest that the Missouri Valley Authority advocates have switched to the tactics of boring from within.

The old issue of sufficiency of water, and who gets it, has been raised again. It has been presented by the Governors of Montana and Missouri. This could be more than coincidence. Montana and Missouri are the chief spawning ground of MVA propaganda.

Governors Bonner, of Montana, or Smith, of Missouri, are serving their first terms, and are not as familiar with the background of Missouri Basin development as older members of the committee. We believe they are acting sincerely, but surmise they have been getting bad advice from people who don't want to see the valley development proceed the way Congress has determined it should.

These people, badly beaten in every attempt even to get a hearing for their authority plan in Congress, are trying to fan the old feud between the upper and lower regions of the Missouri Valley.

That original quarrel was between irrigation and navigation interests. Congress satisfied the irrigation interests when it amended the Flood Control Act of 1944 to give irrigation priority over navigation in the use of water arising in States "wholly or in part" west of the ninety-eighth meridian. This, in effect, assures all irrigable portions of the Missouri Basin that they will not be deprived by navigation of any water they need for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses. That should satisfy the present Montana Governor as it satisfied his predecessor and the Montana water board.

Navigation doesn't figure in the attempt to revive the feud. Instead, the complaint is heard from Missouri that the upper States may take so much water that there won't be enough to satisfy downstream needs for drinking purposes and sanitation.

This ignores a public health survey which advised that about 1⅓ million acre-feet of water in the Missouri River below Sioux City would be adequate for drinking supply and sanitary purposes during the winter season when water normally would be stored for the following irrigation and navigation seasons. That is only about one-sixteenth of the average annual flow of the river at Sioux City. And it probably is less than the amount that would be released in power production anyway.

It ignores also a fundamental precept of water law and policy—that rights to water necessary for health and sanitation have first call.

The Montana and Missouri arguments, lumped together, make a weak wedge for any one to try to drive into the co-operative efforts of the Missouri Basin States to retain direction of the basin development with a minimum of Federal master-minding.

But they also show to what lengths the disciples of Washington totalitarianism are driven in their campaign to wreck Missouri Basin unity for the Pick-Sloan plan.

INVESTIGATION OF NATION-WIDE GAMBLING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have issued a statement on the importance of an investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities. I believe such an investigation would have a tremendous salutary effect, and could lay the groundwork for revisions in our obsolete anticrime laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I released be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that it be followed by a brief, clear-cut editorial endorsing this general idea, published in the January 1 issue of the Milwaukee Journal.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY SUGGESTING JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INTERSTATE GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

I believe that there is an excellent chance that the Senate Judiciary Committee will act on some version of legislation for a thorough investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities. It is quite obvious to Members of Congress and the Department of Justice that present legal weapons available against the multi-billion-dollar crime syndicates are hopelessly obsolete. This holds true, particularly for our puny "popgun" methods of coping with gambing syndicates which rely on interstate wire and telephone facilities for their widespread operations.

It is quite obvious too that the Federal Treasury is losing literally billions of dollars in potential taxes because of the secrecy of income gained through the underworld's "take" in gambling, slot-machine and related activities. At the same time, it is obvious that no investigation will achieve real results unless it rips into the rotten heart of the tie-up between gambling syndicates and crooked politicians in State capitals and city halls. Merely arresting a few "tin horn" gamblers has been done too many times, while the real "big shots," well protected by tie-ins with crooked officeholders, have invariably escaped the net.

I believe that Senator KEFAUVER is to be congratulated for sponsoring the racketeering investigation idea. Necessarily, however, it would have to be taken up in its turn on the already crowded docket of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I suggest specifically that my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee look very earnestly into the question of authorizing a joint Senate-House committee to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering, rather than a Senate Judiciary subcommittee alone. The reason for that is this: There is a tremendous amount of waste motion involved, if we in the Senate hold hearings, suggest legislation and then if the House holds almost identical hearings to evaluate our proposals. It is important that we concentrate all our facilities against the big shots and that we mobilize the full weight of the FBI and other investigators in this process. It is essential, too, and I am sure my colleagues will agree, that this investigation not degenerate into a headline-hunting expedition which would barely scratch the surface of countless underworld activities.

Any investigation must proceed with the full cooperation of State and municipal officials in law enforcement work. Moreover, it will come to naught unless we strive toward a public awakening of the evils of gambling and a public crusade for effective enforcement of existing State and local laws. The Federal Government cannot do the job alone.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 1, 1950]

CONTROLLING INTERSTATE GAMBLING

It may be hoped that the Senate will adopt the proposal of Senator KEFAUVER (Democrat, Tennessee) that organized gambling in the country be investigated. There is evidence that national gambling syndicates are spreading their activities in the larger cities of the country. It is known, too, that they operate in such fashion that they often become entrenched before responsible local people know of their presence. Once organized in a city, it is extremely difficult to get rid of them.

In such a situation, a national study looking to a national remedy is indicated. In this connection it is well to remember that kidnaping and the white-slave traffic continued as serious problems until Congress, alarmed at the growing menace, passed Federal control measures.

Where there is an interstate angle there can be a Federal remedy. There is reason to suppose that, if Congress took an interest in the matter, gambling syndicates could be as well controlled as drug traffickers now are. Somehow Federal courts seem to be able to carry out the intent of control laws better than some of our State courts.

EVERYBODY WANTS SOMETHING POSITIVE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, recent proposals by my distinguished colleague [Mr. TYDINGS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], looking toward improvement in the current arms competition, have found a receptive ear among our people generally.

The attached editorial from the Baltimore Morning Sun of Saturday, February 18, is an example of the conviction so widely felt and expressed as the need of something—anything—positive that might possibly be done in the interests of heading off conditions likely to produce another world-wide conflagration.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Baltimore Morning Sun of Saturday, February 18, be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

EVERYBODY WANTS SOMETHING POSITIVE

Not content with Secretary Acheson's careful statement of the reasons why he considers peace negotiations with Soviet Russia impossible just now, Senator TYDINGS has repeated his plea for a world-wide disarmament conference. Like Mr. Churchill, he feels that an approach to Russia would not do any harm. Like Senator MCMAHON, he considers that a bold gesture of some sort is necessary to stop the course of events. Such a disarmament conference would at the worst, he believes, tell the world who was responsible for failure.

Whatever one may think of the specific suggestions of Senator Tydings, Senator McMahon, and Mr. Churchill, these three men unquestionably have a point. If we look back over the tangled story of the postwar years, we find that our most notable diplomatic successes have been the result of certain simple and dramatic decisions. Each of them is asking, in effect, for another simple and dramatic decision.

The so-called Truman doctrine was the first of these. We decided that a Communist conquest of Greece and the continued pressure of Soviet Russia on Turkey could not be tolerated. We took certain steps. As a result, Greece was not conquered, and the pressure on Turkey was relaxed.

Another was the establishment of the air lift. The Russian tactic of isolating Berlin was met by the decision that if the western sectors of Berlin could not be supplied by ground transportation they would be supplied by air transportation. The simplicity of this decision obscured its brilliance and daring. It was responsible for a diplomatic victory of incalculable importance.

The third was the Marshall plan. It is easy to forget now how rapidly the state of affairs in western Europe was disintegrating in 1946 and 1947. The simplicity of General Marshall's idea, again, concealed in some degree its brilliance and its daring. The Marshall plan has not done everything that was hoped of it. But it stopped the disintegration of western Europe.

Today people are tremendously concerned about Asia and the atomic armaments race. What about them?

The best that Secretary Acheson feels able to offer is a program, at once tedious and nerve-wracking, of methodically opposing every Soviet Russian move with a countermove, of reinforcing weak spots, plugging holes, concentrating on specific situations as they develop. As he says:

"This road is a very long one and a very difficult one. It takes purpose, continuity of purpose, perseverance, sacrifice, and it takes, more than almost anything else, very steady nerves."

But, under a popular government, a policy which depends above everything else on "steady nerves" is the most difficult of all to "sell" as well as to administer. Under popular government, people need something more than admonitions to be patient and to prepare for sacrifices. They need evidence that the patience leads somewhere, and that the sacrifices will yield tangible successes.

"Where are we heading?" they ask. "Just what is our policy, anyway?"

It is the vagueness and flexibility and obscurity of our present policy, the lack of a definite goal that everybody can understand, that leads such men as Senator TYDINGS and Senator MCMAHON and Mr. Churchill to speak out for something definite—an atomic-energy meeting, a world disarmament conference, a world-wide Marshall plan—anything that will somehow bring the boil to a head and yield relief. In their specific suggestions, these three men may be wrong. But they are right in sensing that something positive is needed to balance the negative virtues of perseverance, sacrifice, and steady nerves.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on the twentieth day of January last, Gen. Douglas MacArthur sent to the majority leader of the Senate the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1950.*
Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,
Majority Leader,
United States Senate,
(Report delivery Washington D. C.)

A delegation from the Japanese National Diet will shortly visit Washington in the course of a tour of the United States to observe on the American scene our concepts of democracy in action. This group CMA representing a legislative body patterned in form very much after our own CMA seeks orientation of Japanese thinking from a practical view of American legislative procedures as evolved through their historical development. I shall be most grateful for any assistance which you and other Members of the Senate may give to this delegation which will serve to guide and encourage the progress of representative Government in Japan and further our national aims underlying the occupation.

Cordial regard.

MACARTHUR,
SCAP, Tokyo, Japan.

On the 26th day of January last, in reply to the telegram, and also in line with a visit made by officers of the Army to my office, I sent the following telegram:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1950.
General of the Army DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
Supreme Commander, Allied Powers,
APO 500, Care of Postmaster,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR GENERAL MACARTHUR: Tracy S. Voorhees, Under Secretary of the Army, called at my office recently and advised me that a delegation from the Japanese National Diet will shortly visit this country, appearing at the State capitals and the Capital of the United States.

I advised Mr. Voorhees I should be most happy to show these gentlemen every Senatorial courtesy, which will help them develop the kind of interest in representative government we so desire.

With every good wish, I am,
Yours very sincerely,

SCOTT W. LUCAS.

Mr. President, when these gentlemen left Japan, General MacArthur made a very notable address. I shall not take time to read it to the Senate, but I hope every Member of the Senate will read the memorable address General MacArthur made to the delegation of the Japanese Diet immediately before their departure from Japan to the United States of America. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by General MacArthur may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

As leader and active participants in the most peaceful political transformation ever effected by any country, east or west, you represent the new Japan, which places its faith in the sovereign will of the people rather than in dictatorship of the few. Most of you began your Diet careers following the surrender. All of you resisted the single-party system imposed upon your country by the discredited leadership of the past. I wish to congratulate you and your colleagues upon the signal success you have achieved in making genuine representative government a reality. At the outset, I had confidence in the ability of the people to understand, cherish, and defend the liberties and dignity they won only at the staggering cost of war and defeat. Now after six sessions of the National Diet under the new constitution, my confidence in the true self-governing spirit of the people is stronger than ever. As their agents, you have given every indication of being able to fulfill the three basic functions of a representative assembly, making laws, supervising the administration of laws, and looking after the diverse individual and group interests of the people. In your new Diet law, you incorporated many of the salient features of the United States Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I distinctly recall that shortly after the Diet law was enacted about 3 years ago, the speaker at that time, Mr. Yamazaki, chairman of this delegation, proposed the study mission that you are now undertaking. I recommended then that more could be gained from a study of this nature after the Diet had had practice with its new procedures. You are now in a position to observe and evaluate the United States Congress and State legislatures against the background of much experience. You can concentrate on the letter and spirit of those American legislative practices which are essential to your needs and thereby accomplish much more than you might have at an earlier date. From the cordial and sympathetic discussions you have had with numerous delegations of United States Congressmen in your own Diet building, you may take for granted the hospitable treatment and generous assistance you will receive in the United States. Representative democracy is much more than popular elections and the assembling of successful candidates in legislative halls. The essential thing is that the people themselves rule, that legislators are the people's servants, reelecting and carrying out the people's will, that the combined wisdom of all is sounder than the arbitrary dictates of the few. This is the most difficult form of government. It imposes a burden of responsibility upon all citizens and encourages them to observe the conduct of their legislative agents. For over 300 years, Americans have conducted their affairs through popularly elected local assemblies, and for more than 150 years the United States has conducted its far-flung and ever-expanding affairs through a National Congress of State and district representatives. I urge you to observe closely the attitude of typical Americans toward their representatives and especially the attitude of elected representatives toward the desires and opinions of their constituents; and upon your return I urge you to inform your constituents and your colleagues concerning your observations of the fundamental spirit which underlies representative democracy in America at all levels.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as majority leader of the Senate, I am certain I speak in behalf of all Members of this deliberative body when I say that we are very happy that these gentlemen have come from far-away Japan to study our form of government, not only in the Nation's Capital, but in various State capitals of the United States.

We are deeply indebted to General MacArthur for having arranged the trip. In the General's message it will be found he says that this delegation from the Japanese Diet, now in America, individually resisted the single-party system imposed upon them by the party in power at the time of the attack upon

Pearl Harbor. This statement is of extreme importance to Members of this body, who have been elected by the people. Mr. President, we are the people's servants. It is our duty to carry out their will. It is under this system of free government, that our great country has advanced to the true leader in world affairs. I hope that our distinguished visitors will understand we greet them in the spirit of sympathetic cooperation, that their stay in the country will be a happy and profitable one in the interest of a representative democracy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who sits for the moment in the seat of the minority leader, I join with the majority leader in welcoming these gentlemen from Japan. I may also say that, as a Senator from Massachusetts, and as one who reads the Boston newspapers very regularly, I am glad to welcome them. I do not agree with the action of the Boston City Council, which has been given such broad publicity. I hope that our visitors, through the other functions they were able to attend in Massachusetts and through their visits to other places in the State, were able to dispel from their minds any feeling that the reception given them in the city of Boston by the city council was indicative of the general attitude of the Massachusetts' citizenry.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should merely like to join with the able majority leader and the acting minority leader in expressing a word of welcome to the delegation that is here. During November and December it happened to be my privilege to be in Japan and to visit both houses of their Parliament. As a Senator of the United States representing the State of California I received a most cordial welcome in both houses of the Japanese Parliament, and had the opportunity of meeting the very fine and able group who are carrying on the democratic processes in Japan. I join with the majority leader in expressing a real welcome to these distinguished representatives of the Parliament of Japan on the occasion of their visit to our legislative body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to join with the majority leader and with my colleagues from Massachusetts and California in this word of welcome. I was in Japan during the month of September of the past year. With General MacArthur, I had the privilege of meeting the leadership in the Japanese Diet, both in the council, which corresponds to our Senate, and in the house itself, which corresponds to our House of Representatives. I had the privilege of talking with the president of the council and with the speaker of the house, and I was very much impressed with the cordial feeling existing between their group and those of us who represented the Congress of the United States. I am happy as a Senator from New Jersey to reciprocate the expression of welcome I received in Japan by joining in extending to our distinguished friends from Japan this word of welcome.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I, too, join with the majority leader and other Senators who are welcoming members of the Japanese Parliament on their visit to the Senate of the United States. I also desire to pay tribute to one particular Senator. I think the attitude of all the Senators is noble, but I want to pay tribute particularly to the laudable purpose and the fine citizenship displayed in the noteworthy gesture made here today by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It has touched me deeply.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as one of the Senators from the State of New York, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my colleagues who have spoken before me. I deeply hope that the time may not be distant when Japan will be equipped to take a place in the great family of free democratic nations. I am very glad, on behalf of the State of New York, to welcome our visitors from Japan.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first, I desire to commend General MacArthur for having sent this delegation to America to study our form of government. Next, I am very proud, when I read his statement, to note that he instructed them to be sure to visit South Carolina and also New York on their tour. I know that when these gentlemen from Japan went to South Carolina recently they received proper recognition and a demonstration of good old southern hospitality, which can only be extended by South Carolinians. I want to join our majority leader in what he has said today in welcoming these gentlemen.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to lift my voice in consonance with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I want to express in my own way my feeling of repugnance and shame that the city officials of my native city of Boston, Mass., should have shown the un-Christian attitude, and I say the Un-American attitude, which they displayed in the city hall in recent weeks when this group came before them. So I join with other Senators in saying I am glad to have these gentlemen from Japan here today in the Senate of the United States, and to greet them in fine fellowship, as human beings, under God, facing a great future for Japan and this Nation of ours in one world.

I want to say also to my friends from Japan who are here, this is America, the United States of America, which we love, a free country of free men, and it is the only country in the world where such a greeting could be extended toward men who have been enemies of ours in the recent past, but who today come here as friends, with hands extended to them in greeting and in fellowship, with no guile or hypocricy, but in all sincerity. Today, in the United States Senate, here at Washington, we greet Japan.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a Senator from the State of North Dakota, where many Japanese were interned at Fort Lincoln during the war, I wish the Senate to know that a great many citizens of our State became acquainted with people of Japanese origin from the west coast, and that as a result of that acquaintanceship, I am personally happy to welcome this delegation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to all the Senators who have joined me in a very cordial and heartfelt welcome to our distinguished visitors from Japan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is agreeable to the Senate, the Chair will have inserted in the RECORD a list of the distinguished Members of the Japanese Diet who have just visited us.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list follow the remarks which have been made by the various Senators.

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

The list of Members of the delegation from the Diet of Japan is as follows:

JAPANESE DIET DELEGATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (466 MEMBERS)

Democratic Liberal (266). Takeshi Yamazaki (Chairman of Delegation), 63, Ibaragi Pref., 8th term, former Speaker; Nobuyuki Iwamoto, 54, Kanagawa Pref., 3d term, Vice-Speaker; Chusuke Imamura, 50, Nagano Pref., 2d term, member Steering Committee.

Democrat (70). Saburo Shiikuma, 54, Hokkaido, 3d term, former Parliamentary Vice-Minister Communications, member Steering Committee.

Social Democrat (47). Inejiro Asanuma, 51, Tokyo, 5th term, member (former Chairman) Steering Committee.

People's Cooperative (14). Takizo Matsumoto, 48, Hiroshima Pref., 3d term, Harvard U. graduate, former Parliamentary Vice-Minister Foreign Affairs, member Foreign Affairs Committee.

Secretariat: Makoto Oike, 54, Nagano Pref., Secretary-General; Seiichi Shima, 35, Toyama Pref., Chief Liaison Officer.

HOUSE OF COUNCILLORS (250 MEMBERS)

Green Breeze Society (74). Hiroshi Takada, 51, Tokyo, Chairman Steering Committee.

Democratic Liberal (52). Hidejiro Onogi, 54, Kyoto, former member House of Peers, member Judicial Affairs Committee.

Social Democrat (41). Kanae Hatano, 53, Fukuoka Pref., former Minister Agriculture and Forestry, member Finance and Budget Committees.

Democrat (42). Tatsuro Sakurauchi, 64, Tokyo, former member House of Representatives 2 terms, Chairman Finance Committee.

Secretariat: Hideaki Kondon, 47, Shimane Pref., Secretary-General.

National Diet Library: Tokujiro Kanamori, 63, Tokyo, former State Minister, Chief Librarian.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that the Senate stand in recess for 15 minutes, in order that we may become better acquainted with these gentlemen, who are with us as representatives of the Japanese Parliament.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 15 minutes.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Vice President.

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 58) to amend

the Senate rules by creating a standing Committee on Small Business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time between now and 4 o'clock, when the vote is to be taken, is to be equally divided between the proponents of the resolution and those opposed, to be controlled by the junior Senator from Nebraska and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to be recognized at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to be as soon as the distinguished majority leader yields.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield now.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the distinguished majority leader yields, I may state that I understand that the total time remaining will be practically 3 hours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, an hour and a half to each side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An hour and a half to each side, deducting the 4 minutes which have already elapsed.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I informed the Senator from Nebraska and the press that I was going to discuss a subject and give facts which I think will be of great interest to the Senate and the press. However, in view of the limitation of time between now and 4 o'clock, I shall not be able to do it until that hour. I hope to get the floor as soon as possible after 4 o'clock. I believe the facts which I shall disclose at that time will interest the Senate very greatly, and I hope as many Senators as possible will be on the floor then. My remarks will deal with the extent to which Communists have infiltrated into the State Department and are shaping State Department policy. I intend to cover that subject in detail as soon as I get the floor at 4 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration authorized the junior Senator from Nebraska to report favorably Senate Resolution 58, which is the unfinished business, and is now before the Senate for consideration. In the report, which was made on June 29, 1949, will be found comments and observations on small business in the United States, which indicate the interest not only of the junior Senator from Nebraska, but of many other Senators. Any Member of the Senate who is interested, and who will analyze the report, will find that it is estimated that there are 3,650,000 small-business concerns in the United States, owned and operated, on the average, by 2½ persons each. This constitutes a total of 9,125,000 persons, or 92 percent of our entire manufacturing economy. These concerns employ about 65 percent of all commercial and industrial wage earners, and produce about 45 percent of our entire output.

Those are the figures that were used in the report to the Senate made by me on June 29, 1949, to which I have referred, when the resolution to create a standing Committee on Small Business, with legislative authority, was reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

On July 6, 1949, the report was placed in the RECORD, but I doubt that the Members of the Senate recall what that report set forth as the work objective of a permanent Small Business Committee. The report states:

> Your committee envisions that the work of the Committee on Small Business will include, but not be limited to, the study and investigation of—
>
> 1. Supply and distribution of basic materials with particular reference as to whether or not independent small business is obtaining its fair share of such materials under existing or future distribution methods and patterns:
>
> 2. Policies of Federal Government departments, agencies, and corporations with respect to inclusion of independent small business in their present programs and future planning with particular reference to the procurement activities of such departments, agencies, and corporations;
>
> 3. Prices charged for materials needed and utilized by independent small business to determine whether they are fair and equitable in relation to prices charged their larger competitors;
>
> 4. Pressures of vertically and horizontally integrated combinations to eliminate independent small business in the American industrial productive and distributive system;
>
> 5. Inability of both new and old independent small business to adequately finance itself from its own earnings due to tax structure and effect of such tax structure on the merger movement;
>
> 6. Participation of independent American small business in foreign-aid programs and adequacy of representation of independent American small business by diplomatic and consular officials abroad;
>
> 7. Development of programs to adequately insure independent small business a fair share of raw and finished materials and services on and from public-owned resources, forest services, irrigation and reclamation projects;
>
> 8. Development of a sound program to safeguard the place of independent small business in the American economy.

Mr. President, that is a program which is essential to the welfare and survival of independent business in this country.

The number and importance of the problems peculiar to small business warrant the establishment of a permanent committee in the Senate which will give full time and attention to the solution of these problems, as I stated last Friday, and which will have authority to recommend remedial legislation to the Senate.

Mr. President, I maintain that there is no one committee in the United States Senate which can give the time even to consider legislation from the standpoint of its effect upon smaller business, much less make the necessary investigations into our economy, or of regulatory agencies, when quick action may be needed to prevent the ringing of the death knell of an entire segment of our economy.

Mr. President, the special Senate Small Business Committee was permitted to expire by default on January 31, 1949. I hope the businessmen of the country will ponder and appreciate that statement. The committee was terminated, and has not been revived during this session of the Eighty-first Congress, although effort upon effort has been made, during this session of the Eighty-first Congress, to have considered on the floor of the Senate a resolution which would reestablish that committee for the benefit of small-business men.

Prior to the expiration of the committee, and before it was actually off the books, a legislative proposal was presented by the junior Senator of Nebraska, and by the senior Senator from Montana, to continue the special Senate Small Business Committee. Senate Resolution 29 was submitted on January 13, 1949, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. And it was because Senate Resolution 29 was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, instead of the Committee on Rules and Administration, that I submitted Senate Resolution 55.

The reasons for submitting Senate Resolution 55 were:

First, to insure continuity for the Senate Small Business Committee is essential.

Second, because there has sprung up in the Banking and Currency Committee a movement to take over all of the prerogatives of small business in the Senate, investigative and legislative.

Senate Resolution 33, submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] on January 17, 1949, was called a resolution to provide for "Succession to the Special Committee on Small Business Committee." It was unanimously reported to the Senate from Banking and Currency on January 27, 1949.

It proposed that the Small Business Subcommittee on Banking and Currency take over all the functions and duties of the former special committee.

That assumption was based upon a conviction that special committees are prohibited by the Legislative Reorganization Act, and the committee's report also emphasized the need for prompt legislative action on small-business problems, which authority a special committee did not have.

Senate Resolution 33 was never acted upon, and was replaced on the calendar later by Senate Resolution 101, entirely different in purpose.

Senate Resolution 55 was referred to Banking and Currency, and, both Senate Resolution 29 and Senate Resolution 55 were reported upon unfavorably by Banking and Currency within a short time.

There has been a persistent impression among some Members of the Senate that the Legislative Reorganization Act prohibits the establishment of special and select committees.

When the legislative reorganization bill was passed by the Senate—and I was a Member of the Senate when it was passed and heard the debate on the issue—it contained a provision prohibiting the creation of special or select committees.

Many of us, including the junior Senator from Nebraska, because time was

running out, went along with such a provision in order to get the entire act passed. This was particularly true since section 101 (b) was retained, which gives full right to the Senate to change its own rules; one of those rules relating to the committee-forming power.

In other words, even though the Reorganization Act was passed, it does not mean that never can we amend it for the purpose of setting up a committee. The Senate governs its own procedure, and can at any time amend its rules, if it so desires, especially so with respect to the establishment of new committees.

When the legislative reorganization bill went to the House, the provision prohibiting the continuation or creation of special or select committees was stricken from the measure, and the House insisted on its amendments in conference.

The reason the House insisted on its amendments was that it had already set up some special committees. The House had already provided for a Special Small Business Committee, which it did not want to legislate out of existence. So the House struck out the restriction placed in the bill by the Senate.

One of the authors of the Legislative Reorganization Act, Senator La Follette of Wisconsin, moved to accept the House version of the bill which contained a provision that special committees could be established. When the conference report came to the Senate, it was approved, and the House version of the bill was enacted into law.

Because of the limit placed on debate today it is impossible for me to give all the colloquy and debate that occurred at that time respecting the measure, but let me say that it all was summed up by me in 1949, as appears on page 840 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, my statement, beginning in the first column of that page with the words, "There appears to be some misunderstanding and confusion regarding the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," down to and including the paragraph in the third column on page 840, beginning with the words, "The reason for the passage of the Reorganization Act." I ask to place this matter in the RECORD because I wish to present the summary of the history of the act; the fact that the Senate passed the Reorganization Act without the provision prohibiting the creation of a special committee or committees, and the fact that the House would not go along with such a provision. As the measure was approved, it provides that special committees may be organized.

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

There appears to be some misunderstanding or confusion regarding the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Some persons have said, and have told me, and some Members of the Senate have said, that special committees are prohibited by that act. Mr. President, that simply is not so; such a prohibition is not to be found among the provisions of that act. When the legislative reorganization bill passed the Senate, it contained a provision prohibiting the creation of special or select committees. I say it contained that provision when it passed the Senate; but many of us, including the junior Senator from Nebraska, went along with such a provision in order to get the entire act passed because of the fact that time was running out. It will be remembered that when consideration was given to the bill on the floor of the Senate, time was running out, and we took the bill as the Senate passed it, with that provision included. But section 101, subsection (b) gives full right to the Senate to change its own rules, one of which recognizes the committee-forming power of the Senate. However, when the bill went to the House, the provision prohibiting the continuation or creation of special or select committees was stricken from the measure. In conference, the House insisted on its amendment. The House amendment provides for the creation of such committees.

One of the authors of the bill, former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, seated where the Senator from Kansas is now seated, voted to accept the House version of the bill, and in this form it was enacted into law. Therefore, from a legal standpoint, there is no prohibition against the creation of a special committee either by Senate resolution or by joint resolution, or by an act of the Congress itself.

That is the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I supported that act. I voted for its passage, and I did it with that full understanding. At that time I was a member of this special committee, and even though when the Senate passed the bill I voted for the provision against the creation of special committees, yet when the conference report came back it pleased me very much, and the bill passed the Senate by adopting the conference report, which did not prohibit the creation of special committees. Indeed, this is amply evidenced by the creation or the continuance of many joint committees by this body, such as the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, the Joint Committee on Housing, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, which were created in 1948. The fact that these committees have been created by an act of Congress or by a joint resolution rather than by Senate resolution in no way changes their status.

Distinguished Members of the Senate have told me they recognize it is not a violation. One of our best constitutional lawyers tells me it is not a violation of the provisions of the Reorganization Act. Some of those who oppose special committees say, "No, their creation does not violate the law, but does violate the spirit of the act." Certainly Senators who feel that way will agree with me that the joint resolutions and acts of Congress creating the various special joint committees I have enumerated have been passed by their votes, and they have not moved to abolish those committees since they were created. So if those who oppose this resolution on the theory that it violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act continue to appropriate money and to set up special joint committees as they have done, then they are doing exactly what is sought by the resolution I have offered and asked to have referred to the Rules and Administration Committee. There is no difference. The legal status is the same. There is no violation of the spirit of the act; if one is right, so is the other. If we continue to create such committees, if we continue them in existence, if we continue to appropriate for them, we are doing nothing more, there, than I am asking the Senate to do, in this instance. It involves neither a violation of the act itself nor a violation of the spirit of the act.

There is no reason to dwell upon this, for it is my strong conviction that neither the creation of those joint committees nor the creation of the special committee sought by the resolution violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

The reason for the passage of the Reorganization Act, as I understand, was to simplify the operation of Congress, and with that I am in total agreement. The original provision contained in the Senate version of the act prohibiting the creation of special committees was designed to prevent creation of special committees when a standing committee had jurisdiction of the subject matter. That was the principal argument used. It was said, "Here is a standing committee which has jurisdiction. Therefore, a special committee that assumes the same jurisdiction, duplicates the work." I can remember the arguments so ably presented by the then Senator from Wisconsin. He certainly made a convincing argument on that basis, and that was one of the reasons given, if I recall correctly.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, Mr. President, from a legal standpoint, there is no prohibition against the creation of special committees, either by Senate resolution, by joint resolution, or by act of Congress. Of course, I know that some may say that the establishment of a new committee would violate the spirit of the Reorganization Act. Let me, as one who believes in the Legislative Reorganization Act, and who voted for it, and who today is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and of other committees say that my experience is that Senators have more conflicting dates for attendance on committee meetings now than they had before the passage of the Reorganization Act. I doubt very much whether the Reorganization Act has cut down the number of committees Senators are called upon to attend. They are now called subcommittees rather than special committees. I do not disapprove of the result of the Reorganization Act, but I may say to those who feel that the creation of a new committee would violate the spirit of the act, that it is my belief that we have created nearly as many committees, which we now call subcommittees, as we would have had if the Reorganization Act had not been passed.

Because of the very fact that the House insisted upon this provision, there is today a Special Small Business Committee in the House of Representatives. That committee is functioning very well. This is the first time since I have been a Member of the Senate that we have not had a corresponding committee in the United States Senate.

The point of whether a special or select committee violated the intent and purpose of the Legislative Reorganization Act has been a bone of contention every time a resolution to continue, or to grant funds to the Senate Small Business Committee, has come before the Senate, although the House of Representatives has gone ahead without interruption with its special and select committees.

Senate Resolution 58 which confronts the Senate today is: First, an effort to meet two of the most strongly expressed objections to a Special Small Business Committee, the resolution proposed to establish a new standing committee for small business; and second, it proposes to

give that committee full legislative and investigative authority.

The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] introduced Senate Resolution 58 on February 7, the same day the junior Senator from Nebraska, made the appeal from the Chair's decision to commit Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I joined with him at that time.

Senate Resolution 58 offers a better way of meeting the objections to a Special Small Business Committee, and it would strengthen such a committee's position and authority immeasurably.

The junior Senator from Nebraska is not unmindful of the fact that a number of Senators object to a standing Small Business Committee, because it would cut across the jurisdictional lines of other standing commitees. That same argument may be used to defend the need for a separate Small Business Committee on the grounds that what is everyone's business, is no one's business.

The problems of small business have shifted through war and postwar years. They are still shifting between a hot war and a cold war, but they still go on, and it is more important now to have a committee in the Senate that can speak strongly in behalf of small business, than it was during and before war years.

Mr. President, I received more mail today than ever before from small-business men, asking for relief from directives and orders, asking for help in finding their way around among the bureaus in Washington, so they may bid for contracts which may arise by reason of appropriations made for Government procurement, the ECA, and other matters to which I shall refer as I speak during the present debate. They are knocking at the door asking for help, asking for guidance and direction, and they are certainly asking for a different form of financial help than they now can obtain.

When I came to the Senate in 1943 I was assigned to membership on the Small Business Committee, and was actively engaged in working on that committee until it was terminated by the majority party at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress. They have refused to revive it until the election, which will occur next November, has come closer to hand.

Whether a special committee is continued on a permanent basis, or a standing legislative committee is newly established, the responsibility is still ours to encourage by every means possible the basis of our industrial life, which is free, competitive enterprise. That is our job, and small business needs that protection now more than ever before.

Senate Resolution 58 has been on the Senate Calendar since June 29, 1949. It was first called on the calendar on July 6. Every time it has come up on the calendar, I have requested its consideration; but every time I have done so, some Senator has objected to its consideration. At the time it was reached on the calendar on July 6, the majority leader stated that he objected on the grounds that certain Members who wanted to be heard on the resolution were not then in the Chamber. He offered the information, too, that the Democratic Policy Committee at that time was unanimously in opposition to the appointment of a standing committee. He did not express himself as to how the Democratic Policy Committee felt about the appointment of a special committee.

On July 26, Senate resolution 58 was again reached on the calendar. At that time several Senators, unidentified, objected.

So it went through all the calendar calls in the past session, and throughout the present session until now.

I wish to congratulate the majority leader, regardless of the purpose, on bringing the resolution before the Senate at this time. I think it is a fine thing that it has been brought up now. I hope something constructive will come from this proposed legislation.

But in the past, objection has repeatedly been made to consideration of the resolution, in spite of repeated appeals by the junior Senator from Nebraska to the majority leader for consideration of the measure before the end of the session.

Again on the first calendar call of this session, on February 1, the majority leader objected to the consideration of Senate Resolution 58. He did not state what his own personal opinions were regarding the resolution, but he alluded to the conflict of opinion regarding a Small Business Committee in a recent Democratic caucus. I think it is true, there are in the Senate, not only on the other side of the aisle, but on this side of the aisle, Senators who believe that the creation of a Small Business Committee would be in violation of the spirit of the Reorganization Act. There has been a conflict and there will be a conflict on that subject. But regardless of how many Senators vote for or against the creation of such a committee, I shall vote, in behalf of small business, for the creation of a Small Business Committee, either with or without legislative authority, in order that there may be a Senate committee to which small-business men can come, and through which they can speak.

Mr. President, the majority leader and other members of the Senate are entitled to vote on the question of whether the Senate should set up a Senate Small Business Committee, either with or without legislative authorities.

If it is the will of the Senate not to have a Small Business Committee, under any conditions, then that settles the issue, at least for this Congress.

But, Mr. President, why at this late date—well into the second session of the Eighty-first Congress—is an attempt being made to force the issues back and forth, all over again?

Why was not an amendment to Senate Resolution 58, or a measure to meet the objections of the majority offered long before this time?

This brings us to what has happened to the Subcommittee on Small Business in Banking and Currency in the past year.

As I mentioned earlier, the attempt of the Banking and Currency Committee to succeed the former Special Small Business Committee was abandoned.

In place of Senate Resolution 33, the Banking and Currency Committee reported Senate Resolution 101, by which the committee took an entirely different position, and asked for funds to pursue three categories of investigations, among which were investigations of small-business problems. Sixty thousand dollars was asked, $30,000 of which was estimated to be spent on small-business investigations and studies.

Here, I should like to call attention to the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee asked for funds, to study and investigate the problems of small business, which is precisely the reason the Banking and Currency Committee gave when it turned down the resolution, introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska—to create a permanent Small Business Committee, without legislative authority.

Senate Report 128, on Senate Resolutions 29 and 55—the report comes from the Banking and Currency Committee—states, on page 2:

> Your committee—Banking and Currency—believes the time has come to progress from action consisting mainly of analyses, studies, report, and recommendations on small business to practical legislative action designed to save small-business enterprises from gradual extinction in America.

Let us see how the Subcommittee on Small Business has progressed on its "studies and investigations" or its legislative program to save small-business enterprises from extinction. I speak now of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

First, let me remind Senators that the Senate has expressed itself very decisively as to what prerogatives the Banking and Currency Committee may have regarding small-business investigations or legislation.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] offered an amendment to Senate Resolution 101 on May 6, 1949, which was adopted, and specifically limits any small-business activities by Banking and Currency to those subjects directly under its jurisdiction.

I have indicated the view taken of this matter by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and no doubt a similar view will be taken by all other Senate committees. In other words, if we expand the power of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, we run headlong into the very reason why Senate Resolution 58 does not have the support of the Banking and Currency Committee, namely, that it deprives the committee of some of its jurisdiction.

Mr. President, what are the subjects directly under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee? I shall enumerate them:

First. Banking and currency generally. All of us agree as to that.

Second. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under the Reorganization Act. We agree as to that, of course.

Third. Deposit insurance. Of course, we agree as to that.

Fourth. Public and private housing. We agree.

Fifth. Federal Reserve System. We agree.

Sixth. Gold and silver, including coinage thereof. Of course, we agree as to that.

Seventh. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof. We agree as to that.

Eighth. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar. Of course, we agree as to that.

Ninth. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.

Of these nine, matters relating to financial aid and control legislation are the only subjects which I believe to be of direct importance to small business, except, of course, it could be said that all legislation affects small business to some degree.

Tax relief, I think, would be the place to begin on aid to small business; and taxation problems, as well as a number of other finance problems, would be referred to the Senate Finance Committee, not to a subcommittee of Banking and Currency. If a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee were to investigate such problems without authority and were to propose legislation on them without authority, the subcommittee would certainly be cutting across jurisdictional lines, insofar as matters of finance and taxation are concerned.

According to the latest Banking and Currency Committee calendar, which I have before me, one hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Small Business on February 15, 1949. The hearing was held on an amendment to the ECA legislation introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, in accordance with recommendations made by the former Special Small Business Committee. That amendment has been adopted, and I understand that a good job is being done under its provisions.

Mr. President, I wish to insert at this point in my remarks a report from the House committee showing that that measure is resulting in the doing of a good job. That provision was written into the ECA Act; it was offered as an amendment by the junior Senator from Nebraska, and was adopted by the Senate.

The report reads as follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE PROGRESS REPORT, FIRST SESSION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, HOUSE REPORT 1576, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

ECA OPERATIONS UNDER THE SMALL-BUSINESS AMENDMENT

In May 1949, ECA announced the appointment of personnel to formulate procedures to implement the small-business amendment and to handle both the domestic and European phases of the program. During the next months, the committee was in frequent contact with ECA representatives to check on progress.

On September 21, 1949, ECA announced plans for a five-point program to carry out the provisions of the amendment. The program when placed in full operation is designed to provide small-business firms with—

1. A counseling service in exporting under the Marshall plan.

2. Information regarding potential purchases to be made in the United States.

3. A directory of European importers and the products they have purchased under the recovery programs.

4. Information regarding commodities offering the greatest opportunities for sales in western Europe.

5. A directory of potential American exporters listed by commodities for distribution to European importers.

On October 19, 1949, ECA announced the establishment of an inquiry and export counseling group to aid small-business men on their export problems. In addition, it was stated that arrangements had been made with the Department of Commerce whereby its 42 field offices would render assistance to small business in (1) explaining of ECA pricing policies as guides to sellers in negotiations; (2) providing information on documentation; (3) granting advice on regulations governing the handling of overseas shipments; (4) explaining ECA's requirements regarding labeling; and (5) information on how the ECA Commodity Supplier Data may be used to find potential European purchasers.

The committee was informed on October 27 that a field counseling program had been developed by ECA whereby those small-business men interested in participating in the program could obtain practical personalized consultation from other businessmen in their own communities. This project draws on the fund of local business knowledge and relates it to ECA matters by the formation of local volunteer ECA counseling panels. To date this program has been tested in widely separated cities with good results, both in terms of the immediate assistance to local businessmen and in terms of tailoring the program more closely to their needs. Plans are now under way to establish counselor meetings in several hundred cities throughout the country with the help of local chambers of commerce and other similar organizations. ECA states that it intends to maintain constant contact with the field counselors through bulletins on recent developments and to furnish supplementary counseling materials as developed.

As the second step to implement the small-business amendment, ECA announced on November 6, 1949, that it had completed plans to publish a directory of the names and products of American small-business firms desiring to enter or continue in the export trade and would distribute the directory to overseas purchasers. The directory will be printed in the languages of the countries participating in the recovery program and will be paid for out of local currency counterpart funds. ECA is exploring with the Department of Commerce the feasibility of its distributing the directory to countries other than those participating in the recovery programs. This project gives promise of providing great benefit to small business and offers possibilities for further benefits at the conclusion of recovery programs.

ECA has displayed a commendable spirit of cooperation in implementing the small-business amendment and in other matters brought to its attention by the committee. The five-point program recently announced and described above seems to the committee to comprise a realistic approach to the problem of small-business participation. However, the key to insuring equitable participation lies in constant effort to provide small businessmen with timely information on the types and quantities of proposed purchases far enough in advance to permit him to bid or negotiate at the time purchase orders are contemplated.

Another hearing on petroleum prices is listed as having been held by the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Small Business on June 29 and 30, 1949. No testimony is available, and the advice from the clerk of the committee is that the hearings were exploratory; and nothing further has been scheduled at this time.

The subject of petroleum prices would be an interesting one for the subcommittee to get into.

Believe me, Mr. President, we who served on the Special Committee on Small Business know something about prices and allocations, not only as applied to petroleum itself, but also as applied to steel, which was allocated during the Eightieth Congress.

Only one measure—Senate Joint Resolution 93—specifically referring to small business, is listed on the committee calendar having been referred to the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Three other measures of a routine nature are also listed as follows: First, Senate bill 547 to extend voluntary allocations, which are out of existence now; second, Senate bill 548 to extend export controls, which was a routine extension at that time; and third, Senate bill 1570, to preserve export markets for surplus agricultural commodities. In this latter instance, it is notable that when we wrote into the ECA Act the amendment providing that $175,000,000 was to be used for that very purpose, we found that Mr. Hoffman and the Secretary of State interpreted that provision as not being practical, and we found that instead of using the $175,000,000 to purchase surplus wheat in this country—as ECA should have done, because the Secretary of Agriculture declared it was surplus—that money was used to buy wheat or other commodities in other countries, not the surplus wheat in the United States.

None of the matters I have just referred to specifically concern small business.

Mr. President, I do not want to give the impression that I am opposed to permitting the Committee on Banking and Currency to have a Subcommittee on Small Business. Each standing committee is entitled to do what it wishes in that respect, and the idea is not a new one with the Banking and Currency Committee. In fact, I have supported the appropriations for that committee. In the interest of small business, I would prefer to have a Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee, rather than to have no committee on that subject at all. But I say we cannot expand both the authority and investigating power and legislative power of the Banking and Currency Committee without crossing the jurisdictional lines of other committees. If that is done, then we run directly into the question of whether we would prefer to do so or whether we would prefer to have a special committee, without legislative authority, doing the investigating and ironing out the difficulties which confront small-business men, and doing the things that the small-business men of the country really want to have done.

There has been a subcommittee on small business in Banking and Currency since 1947. I do not know all that the subcommittee did during the Eightieth Congress; but it did not in any way in-

terfere with or duplicate the work of the former Senate Small Business Committee, so far as I remember.

However, I think the more effective way to handle small-business matters is to have everything on the subject of small business handled by one committee. After all, what is everybody's business is nobody's business. If we wish to give help to small business, I think we should do so by means of a continuing special committee, without legislative authority, or else by means of a standing committee with authority. I shall vote for either one.

Within the past few days, the Banking and Currency Committee has come before the Senate to ask for the extension of its investigation under Senate Resolution 101, and the use of unexpended funds.

The junior Senator from Nebraska voted for Senate Resolution 101 last year, because he thought then that was all we could expect to obtain for small business at that time, and did not want to leave small business completely without a voice in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I have offered to Senate Resolution 58—an amendment which clearly defines the issues before us, namely, whether we shall have a permanent small business committee, without legislative authority, along the lines proposed in Senate Resolution 55—and it was reported adversely from the Banking and Currency Committee, as originally proposed by the junior Senator from Nebraska, or whether we shall vote for a standing committee with legislative powers, as proposed by Senate Resolution 58.

Senators may think my position is conflicting, but it is not conflicting, Mr. President. I think the Senate should have an opportunity to vote, first, on the question of the appointment of a special committee, as we have had in the past, without legislative authority. Of course, I think the committee should be a permanent one. I do not believe that at each and every session of the Senate we should be confronted with the question of whether we shall have a special committee on small business at that particular session. It is impossible to obtain the right kind of personnel or the right kind of assistance which is needed for such a committee, if the committee personnel know their jobs are not permanent.

I think, once and for all, the Senate should decide whether it wishes to have a special committee on small business, either with or without legislative authority. If Senators wish to vote for the latter, they can vote for the amendment I have offered to Senate Resolution 58. If that is defeated, Senators can vote for Senate Resolution 58 itself, to establish a standing legislative committee, with rank equal to that of every other Senate committee.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered does not propose to violate in any way the rules of the Senate in regard to committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The Senator from Montana submitted an amendment at the close of the session on Friday, but subsequently withdrew it. I do not know his present intentions. I do not believe there is any difference now between the Senator from Montana and the junior Senator from Nebraska, except that the amendment of the Senator from Montana carries a provision for the creation of a committee to continue only during the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses. I submit that if it is possible to extend the life of a special committee through two Congresses it certainly is possible to bind a succeeding session with respect to a permanent committee, as well as to bind the Eighty-second Congress. I think the reason for wanting to carry it through the Eighty-second Congress possibly is that there is but little time left, it seems to me, in which to create a special committee for the remainder of the Eighty-first Congress. But if it is proper to create a committee for the Eighty-first Congress and the Eighty-second Congress, it certainly is proper to create a permanent standing committee, without legislative authority. I hope the distinguished Senator from Montana will join me in the amendment, so that we may have at least two votes. If he desires, he may call it his amendment; it is immaterial to me. I have no pride of authorship. But I think all will agree we should once and for all either make a permanent standing committee, without legislative authority, or a permanent standing committee with authority. Otherwise, we shall have the same difficulty at the beginning of each Congress, and it will be necessary to beg for a continuance of the committee, as a special committee, for the duration of one session of the Congress. If that procedure were followed it would impede the work. It would not permit the continuing employment of personnel to give us the assistance such a committee should have. All along the line, it seems to me, it would not be nearly so effective as a permanent committee upon which we could depend, even though it would be without legislative authority.

As I say, I think the Senate should vote these questions either up or down. If the Senate cannot make up its mind on one of those alternatives, let us give up the idea of trying to do the most effective thing for small business in this Congress, and merely allow matters to proceed as they now are, and await action at some future session of the Congress for the settlement of the issue.

To authorize a temporary small-business committee this late in the Eighty-first Congress, would be a make-shift arrangement, which could not be organized to take effective action before it expired.

To attempt to enlarge or give new authorities to a Subcommittee on Small Business in Banking and Currency would be equal to creating a standing committee within a standing committee—a monstrosity as far as operation would be concerned.

Mr. President, the support which the Senate decides to give to the establishment of a permanent Small Business Committee is not a small problem which may be relegated to the back of our minds, or handled, incidentally, in the major standing committees.

Today, American independent business is threatened not only by the exploitive abuses of concentrated economic power in the hands of "big finance" and "big business," but also by the new developments of economic power in the hands of "big labor" and "big government" which are now on the domestic scene.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to correct a statement made by the Senator from Montana. I am sure, had he read the past RECORD, he would not have made the statement which appears in the RECORD for February 17, at page 1898. In that statement he said no legislation had been introduced by the members of the former Senate Small Business Committee, during the Eightieth Congress, nor had any of its members appeared before standing committees in behalf of legislation. I am sure an examination of the fact will reveal otherwise.

I said last Friday, and I now repeat, that while I am glad to admit that the Senate Small Business Committee during the Eightieth Congress was more distinguished for direct action against monopolistic-trade practices in industry, which were throttling small business, it also made specific legislative proposals, which were enacted into law.

The committee helped in the matter of newsprint distribution. It helped, and helped tremendously, in the field of petroleum distribution. No one can deny that. We persuaded major oil companies to continue distribution to smaller, independent dealers on the basis of the same quotas as those in effect in prior years. The same thing was true in steel. How anyone can even suggest that in the consideration of complaints and examination of needs, such as the petroleum shortage which developed in the city of Baltimore, the Small Business Committee was not effective, I do not know. I wish the distinguished Senator from Maryland were present to give the testimony he gave when we considered and solved the problem of fuel-oil shortage in Baltimore in the winter of 1947.

Mr. President, I yield myself another 5 minutes, in which to conclude.

Time and again the Small Business Committee secured help that was entirely outside the field of legislative authority. It is my plea that we support a proposal which will result in a continued service of that kind. If all we are going to do is to set up an academic board to consider matters affecting small business, a board which will go into the field and conduct hearings in the four corners of the United States, with the idea of introducing legislation which will impose upon the backs of small business further controls and impositions, then I am decidedly against it. I shall be the first Senator on the floor of the Senate to criticize it, if the committee is reorganized and operates solely for that purpose.

I think the principal purpose is to have a place to which small-business men may come, register their complaints, and have them considered. There should be a place to which they may come, where they may receive a friendly hearing, whether it be before a special committee or a subcommittee of some standing committee. But getting back to the subject of legislation, I may say the Small Business Committee did introduce proposed legislation in the Eightieth Congress. Time does not permit me to go into detail, but I want to give the law.

First. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 17, 1947, to insist upon the continuation of export controls upon steel, which was in short supply. The export-control legislation was at that time about to lapse, by default. Saudi Arabia was at that time getting steel which should have gone to our own reserve oil companies. We should have been digging the wells instead of Saudi Arabia. A supply of 340,000 tons was temporarily held up. It has only been since the second session of the Eighty-first Congress that new supplies have been sent. I understand steel is now in ample supply. The statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania was made in support of House bill 3049. I ask that that portion of the report, containing the testimony of the Senator from Pennsylvania, be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It is found in the reports of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, Senate Report No. 825, Eightieth Congress, second session, pages 38 to 41.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN OF THE STEEL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERING THE RENEWAL OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT, REGARDING THE EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROLS ON STEEL (JUNE 17, 1947)

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which you are chairman, has completed hearings upon H. R. 3049, a measure to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities.

In this connection I would like to call your attention to the hearings which have been in progress by the Steel Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee since May 15, 1947. These hearings have been concerned with an investigation of shortages in steel which are affecting the welfare and survival of smaller manufacturers and users of steel. In fact, as 95 percent of our domestic manufacture uses steel, the supply and distribution of steel is a basic consideration in our entire national economy.

In these investigations we have made some study of the situation with respect to shipments of steel in export, and while our inquiry into this situation is not completed and further sessions with the Department of Commerce and with the State Department are on our schedule of hearings, I would like at this time to express some of the facts in relation to the renewal and administration of the Export Control Act (as it pertains to steel) for your consideration.

Steel, and practically all steel products, are in short supply; not in relation to the volume of tonnage being produced, but in relation to a heavy and rising demand. Steel mills are operating at approximately 95 percent of capacity, and are producing finished steel at the rate of 65,000,000 short tons for the year 1947. This is considerably higher than the 49,000,000 tons produced in 1946 and the 46,000,000 tons produced in 1940 (approximate figures).

However, reviving domestic manufacture, rising per capita use of steel, work stoppages affecting the production of steel, and mounting pressures for export of steel have combined to produce a short market in steel.

In spite of this increased demand, and rising per capita use of steel, the steel-producing industry does not intend to increase its capacity, and states further that existing facilities are sufficient for long-term demand. Thus, with a lid on production, and a currently rising demand from every area, the pressures have developed a number of inequities of distribution, under which numbers of smaller concerns are suffering and actually being forced to go out of business.

There apparently is also an increased effort on the part of steel producers to develop export markets, with emphasis on South America. Thus we find that pressures are very much in evidence to cause removal of steel from export control. In fact, so anticipatory that in last Saturday's Washington Post, I noticed an article that stated millions of tons of steel will be going to Saudi Arabia within the next month or two. No such tonnage could be supported giving due consideration to our domestic need, nor could such tonnage be possible under proper export control.

The attention of the Steel Subcommittee was originally called to the steel export situation by a number of complaints from small manufacturers and users who claimed that large shipments of sheet steel abroad were causing their difficulty, and other complaints from independent oil producers, from ranchmen and farmers who protested that large shipments of steel pipe abroad were making it impossible to secure any pipe for oil and gas lines to supplement our domestic supply—and for wells and watering systems for farms and livestock.

The natural-gas and oil shortage has reached serious proportions, as recently stated in news releases, and the Interior Department confirms the possibility of fuel-oil and natural-gas shortages for this fall. While oil barge and other transportation problems were mentioned as a cause, investigation by the Senate Small Business Committee indicates the pipe shortage is also a contributory factor.

In securing figures from the Bureau of the Census on steel exports for the year 1946 and the first 3 months of 1947, we find total exports on the rise in 1947 over 1946, at the rate of what will appear to be a million and a half more tons this year. This represents also about a million more tons of export than shipped in the prewar year of 1938 when there was no shortage of steel and exports were unrestricted. Exports of such critical items as sheet steel and steel pipe and tubing have doubled and trebled in 1946 and 1947 over shipments of those items in normal prewar years.

The Steel Subcommittee was especially interested in shipments of sheet steel and steel pipe—and the countries to which these shipments were being made. Census figures indicate that our prime country of export on most steel products, especially on the vital sheet steel, is Canada. Next in volume are such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Switzerland, and other nations certainly not involved in war rehabilitation projects. Lesser shipments have gone to France and Italy, as we might expect, but not in the degree nor of the critical items as shipped to South America.

In the case of steel pipe—Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, and Russia are chief recipients. In the case of Venezuela, investigation has shown that American oil firms are developing new oil resources in Venezuela which accounts for the large pipe shipments to that country. In the case of Russia, however, it is difficult to figure out any reason for the shipment of 65,000 tons of steel pipe and tubing to that country in 1946, with continued shipments of pipe still going forward—not to mention other steel products, as well. It is not probable that the United States will secure any oil as a result of pipe shipments to Russia, nor for that matter any other trade or economic considerations.

A clipping from yesterday morning's Washington Post gives further information on the oil-shortage situation in this country, and includes a brief, but pointed, statement that Russia is sending its fleet over to get United States gas and oil.

To resume the steel export story: In examining export control administration in the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce and by the Export Policy Control Committee, it was discovered that a simplified method of issuing export licenses has resulted in a number of conditions. (1) No control is maintained on the destination of exports permitted under the export license; (2) relatively little policing of the qualifications or statements submitted by the export licensee is done; (3) no knowledge is available of the end-use of the steel products being shipped in export; (4) export quotas seem to be quite elastic and variable, as determined by Government-sponsored projects.

By this last point it is meant that the Export Policy Control Committee, an interagency group under the general direction of the Commerce Department, ostensibly sets steel export quotas in relation to the strain upon the domestic economy—then it may permit a 20-percent increase to be shipped "exquota"—and then along may come a Government-sponsored project for which may be issued an export license in any amount over and above the original quota (which was supposed to have been set at a level not to disrupt the domestic economy).

The subcommittee is endeavoring to obtain a list of Government-sponsored projects from the Department of Commerce, and the amount of steel exports involved in each. Such Government-sponsored projects, we understand, may be based upon both diplomatic and international trade considerations (and, of course, national defense), and are generally agreed to with the approval of the State Department. Our information is not complete on this subject, but it is of great importance in the steel export picture as it is evidently a matter beyond the control of the nominal export control officials.

Going further into the export picture, it was discovered that in the instance of Canada (our largest receiver of steel products in export), there are no export controls and shipments may be made to Canada in any amount at any time. This situation seemingly dates back to the Hyde Park agreement between Prime Minister MacKenzie King and the late President Roosevelt made during the war, by which controls were eliminated on exports to Canada for a number of wartime considerations.

The question which is naturally raised is whether or not the Hyde Park agreement has been reviewed in the light of present-day economics with respect to steel exports (and undoubtedly other products), to determine why export controls should not be put into effect between Canada and the United States. It is interesting to note that Canada has never removed her export controls upon her shipments to the United States.

The increase of steel shipments to Canada is marked—409,279 tons of steel products were shipped to Canada in 1938, 876,-

135 tons were shipped in 1946, and steel products are being shipped to Canada at the rate of over a million tons per year at the end of the first quarter of 1947. Of this total, sheet-steel shipments are unusually large, which means that steel products such as stoves, refrigerators, and hundreds of other finished products using steel are being manufactured in Canada, rather than the steel going to our own steel-manufacturing industry for production of finished products needed here, and necessary to provide employment in the United States. Also, as no check is maintained on end-use of steel export shipments, it is possible that some steel shipped to Canada may find its way out of Canada to other countries in export.

While normal exports are to be desired to maintain foreign markets and to promote worthwhile and reciprocal projects, it is my opinion that the export situation is out of control and that a stronger hand with regard to exports of steel is of vital importance at this time.

To remove controls on steel would undoubtedly open the floodgates for the highly lucrative export market. Prices being secured for steel in export are twice and three times the mill price in the United States. At the same time an inadequate control, aggravated by the failure of the Department of Commerce to allocate existing manpower and funds, is also causing another set of problems in the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce. I believe that existing controls should be strengthened.

As chairman of the steel subcommittee, I would like to submit for the consideration of your subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee of the Senate, the following conclusions with respect to continuation of export controls and the strengthening of existing controls:

1. Export controls on steel should be continued for at least another 12 months, and should be reviewed at that time to determine the pressure of domestic demand.

2. The Export Control Act should be amended to provide for certain administrative requirements:

(a) That designation of destination be required on the issuance of all export licenses, and, as far as possible end-use of the steel must be indicated.

(b) That the procedures for issuing export licenses require detailed qualifications and identification of licensee, and that severe penalty be provided against forgeries, sales of licenses, and misrepresentation.

(c) That export licenses must be used within the quarter for which they are granted and for the purpose for which granted to the original licensee.

(d) That a review of the Hyde Park agreement with Canada be made at once by the responsible Government agencies, with a view to establishing export controls on steel exports to Canada.

(e) That there be set forth in the extension of the Export Control Act language directing the establishment of industry export advisory committees consisting of all segments of the industries coming under the export control; and that the Export Policy Control Committee be required to seek and give consideration to the recommendation of such committees, particularly with regard to the effect which export quotas and Government special projects might have on the domestic economy.

(f) That the Export Policy Control Committee be thoroughly investigated as to qualification of personnel and methods of operation, especially with respect to its policies for determining export quotas.

(g) And that when such quotas are determined due consideration will be given to see that small and newly established businesses in the export and import trade will be given a fair and equitable share of such quotas.

Mr. WHERRY. Another legislative action recommended by the Small Business Committee was a provision for procurement from small business, under the Selective Service Act of 1948. There is a provision, in section 18 (a), providing for the utilization of industry, which reads as follows:

UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

SEC. 18. (a) Whenever the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the armed forces of the United States, or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section. Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufacture, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

That was provided for in Public Law 750. It was recommended by the junior Senator from Nebraska, as chairman of the Small Business Committee, and it was a good piece of legislation.

The third piece of legislation to which I desire to advert is the ECA amendment, providing for small-business representation in that agency. Senators will recall that last year, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the junior Senator from Nebraska recommended, as former chairman of the defunct committee, that the Senate enact procurement legislation providing that under purchasing programs inspired by ECA funds, small business be given the information and the opportunity to participate. Such legislation was passed by the Senate, in Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, section 7 (d).

Mr. President, finally, the junior Senator from Wyoming will recall that a bill was proposed last session by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], S. 1647, to relieve smaller, independent oil-refining companies from the payment of premiums on their contracts for Government-royalty oil. That was a recommendation by the former Small Business Committee. The Senator from Wyoming paid the committee a compliment when he brought up the legislation on the floor and stated it was recommended by the chairman of the Small Business Committee. It is now Public Law 280, Eighty-first Congress, and another example of legislation recommended by the former committee.

Mr. President, I could go on to give further illustrations of what the Senate Small Business Committee of the Eightieth Congress did. I again want to say the prime importance of the committee is not so much in connection with a legislative function. We have committees to do the legislating. It is true that in our investigation, any subject that needs legislation ought to be brought to the attention of the committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter. But I submit, in all fairness, it is impossible to have this job done as it ought to be done by any one of the jurisdictional committees such as the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is no reflection upon the Senator from South Carolina. I think he is doing as good a job as any chairman could do under the circumstances. But one of two things will have to be done. Either the Senate will have to give this subcommittee the jurisdiction that a special committee needs for investigative purposes, give it legislative authority, and authority to cover all the jurisdictional fields, or else, if the problem is to be handled as I think it should be handled, then the Senate should once and for all set up a permanent special committee similar to the one in the House, and let it cooperate with the one in the House. Either give that committee legislative authority, or else merely give it investigative authority, and let it continue to do the job for the small-business men of the country, on a permanent basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The time reserved by the Senator for himself has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am authorized by the majority leader to take 15 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I merely want to say I have listened with great interest to the very eloquent remarks just concluded by the minority leader. I also wish to say I am in entire accord with him on most of his statements today and I should like to congratulate him upon the eloquence he has displayed in presenting the arguments in support of a program for the solution of small-business problems.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to thank the Senator for that statement.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to say also that the Senator from Nebraska served on the original Small Business Committee set up in the Senate in 1940 under my chairmanship. When he came to the Senate, he became a member of the committee, and it did not take very long for him to become familiar with the work of the committee and to become one of its most active members. He cooperated completely with me as chairman of the committee throughout the time the committee was in existence. In fact, I do not know of any member of the committee who was more energetic or more helpful in the programs we carried through. I recall with a great deal of interest how, when the Senator from Nebraska first began his activities on that committee and before he became

familiar with the entire program, he listened very carefully to some of the speeches I made in the early hearings we held. Very soon I began to observe my good friend from Nebraska making the same speeches I had been making for a year or two before he arrived. So I felt highly complimented by the spirit of emulation he was displaying. He had a thorough grasp of the problem involved and was extremely helpful to the committee.

On one particular occasion I had received great and enthusiastic applause for the arguments I was presenting on behalf of the program of the Small Business Committee. As chairman of the committee, I had the privilege of making the first speech. Therefore, I was in a very advantageous position over that of the Senator from Nebraska. I recall on one occasion he informed me he had another engagement and that he would like to have an opportunity to speak first. Very much to my surprise, I found he was making the same speech and presenting the same points that I had been making at several of the hearings we had held, but must confess his speech was much more eloquent than any I had made. He has today exhibited the same eloquence in behalf of his position on the question which is now before the Senate. I think if the Senate would leave this subject to the Senator from Nebraska and myself we could sit down as a committee of two and work out a program which, if the Senate would accept it, would be highly satisfactory to the small-business men of the country.

We are both convinced that there is real merit to our opposition to either a standing committee with legislative authority or a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee with the expanded jurisdiction which that committee seeks. I think the only proper course for the Senate is to adopt a resolution which will establish a small-business committee in exactly the same form in which the small-business committee was originally established. That committee during the period in which it operated performed very valuable service for the small-business men of the Nation. The Senator from Nebraska will concede that. In fact, he has made similar statements on many occasions.

After the Republicans became the majority party in the Senate and the committee was reestablished under the leadership of the Senator from Nebraska, I cooperated with him to the fullest degree in all his activities in connection with it, and I do not want it understood that I have ever undertaken to criticize the Senator or to intimate that he failed in any respect to perform effective service for the small-business men of the country.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sorry I did not hear all the Senator said, but as one who is in sympathy with the small-business men in their problems, I should like to ask the Senator whether a small-business committee with authority to recommend legislation, would not be, in the opinion of the Senator, and based on his experience, more harmful to small business than it would be helpful?

Mr. MURRAY. I think it would be. In the first place, we could not define the jurisdiction of a standing committee with legislative authority without encroaching upon all the other committees which are already established. It would create vast confusion and difficulties for the legislative work of the Senate. I think the only thing to do is to proceed as in the past with a committee without legislative authority, because it has been demonstrated in the Senate by the small-business committee which operated for a number of years that it is not necessary to have legislative power. Action can be taken quickly and effectively without that authority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In Massachusetts where there are many small businesses, certain interests may not want small industries to develop. Small industries of that character could come before a committee such as that which the Senator recommends and could receive its best judgment, and, if necessary, the committee could make recommendations to other committees regarding legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly true and it is the way in which the Small Business Committee has always operated heretofore. Many small-business concerns representing various industries came before us. I remember that representatives of the baking industry and various other industries of the Nation came before us, for the reason that very often small-business concerns, as a result of the war, found they were unable to continue in business and were facing bankruptcy unless they could get some relief through the Small Business Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senate in its wisdom does not recommend the establishment of such a committee, is it the opinion of the Senator from Montana that the matter should be left as it is until another session of the Congress?

Mr. MURRAY. No. I think that would be a great mistake, because small-business concerns are facing a very serious situation at the present moment. We are now in a buyer's market, and small-business concerns in many lines of industry have developed problems and are in a desperate situation. It seems to me that it would be a serious mistake if the Congress of the United States failed to recognize the conditions which exist in the country at this time and should fail to establish a committee before which businessmen could appear and present their difficulties. A few days ago a couple of representatives of the Automobile Dealers' Association called on me at my office and told me they were facing very serious conditions in the coming year and were very anxious to ascertain what we were going to do with reference to setting up a small-business committee, because they desired to present their problems to that committee when it was established.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. As I understand, the health and welfare of small business throughout the country are now considered and protected, so far as the Senate is concerned, by a Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. I know that many Members of this body would appreciate it if the Senator would point out precisely the weaknesses in the subcommittee approach to the problems of small business.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no desire to make any criticism of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee. I have no desire to criticize the position of any Senator of the United States with reference to position he takes in favor of one or the other of these courses. I am supporting the idea of a special committee because I know from past experience that it has been a successful method of meeting the problems of small business. So far as the Banking and Currency Committee is concerned, I must confess that I am not entirely familiar with what it has accomplished. I know of one or two matters on which it has worked. For instance, it undertook to hold hearings on labor monopoly and conducted some investigations along that line and had witnesses appear before it. Finally, it was discovered that it did not have jurisdiction over the problem, and it was turned over to the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I communicated with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and said, "This is in your jurisdiction. Shall we go ahead and hold hearings?" The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] received permission before hearings were held.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for that information.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Is the senior Senator from Montana prepared to say that the small-business subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency is not properly qualified to protect the best interests of American small business or that the subcommittee is presently doing an inadequate job?

Mr. MURRAY. No. I think the members of the full committee on Banking and Currancy and of its subcommittee are men of unusual ability. I have no criticism to make of any member of the committee. I think they are fully qualified to undertake any problem or study of any problem that may come before the Senate. I feel, however, that it is wrong to continue to turn this problem over to a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, because our experience has been that to hand it over to a committee which has limited jurisdiction would not be as wise as it would

be to refer it to a committee established especially for the purpose of handling small-business problems. That is the only criticism I have to make of the procedure of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], during the course of his remarks, went into that subject in considerable detail, and I am in entire accord with him on this matter.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to point out that small business generally, insofar as its contacts with the Banking and Currency Committee are concerned, appears to be duly appreciative of the fine work which that committee has done in connection with the problems of small business, and those from whom I have heard think it is an adequate place for the problem to be considered.

Mr. MURRAY. Every Senator is entitled to his own judgment and opinion on these questions, and I do not have any quarrel with the position Senators take, but I want to point out that at the present time small business is in a more desperate situation than it has been in at any other time in its history. When we established the original committee in 1940 it was because of the conditions small business had gone through during the period of the depression. Thousands of small-business concerns folded up during that period. It finally became such an important issue in the Nation that the National Democratic Party, at its 1940 Convention, adopted a platform plank approving the establishment of a special committee on small business in the Congress.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Following what the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has said, do I understand correctly that the Senator from Montana objects to the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency because it has too narrow a scope?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency finds that a matter is not within its jurisdiction, can it not set forth all the facts and give those facts to one of the other committees of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, but it would be irregular, it seems to me, for the subcommittee to be undertaking constantly the study of subjects which are not within its own jurisdiction. It would unnecessarily take up the time of the committee, which is one of the most important committees in the Senate. It has very important duties to perform. If they undertake to go over the whole field of small business in the United States, determine what is wrong with small business, and what it is necessary to do in order to preserve it in our system of enterprise, the members of the committee will find that they have too much work to do, and they will neglect some of the other important functions which they have to perform.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to point out that the Chair has informed us that the Banking and Currency Committee has the major interest in the affairs of small business, and it is for that reason that it is currently handling the problems of small business through a subcommittee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that statement has been made many times, but I should like to say that it is not entirely correct. The committee does not have jurisdiction over the major problems of small business, by any means. There are four or five other important committees of the Senate which have functions to perform with reference to small business just as important as those performed by the Banking and Currency Committee. That is true even of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Very few people would think, at first blush, that that committee should consider matters in connection with small-business problems. Yet it has important functions to perform in that field.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I will yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. I should like to commend the Senator from Montana for the splendid work which he and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] have done in behalf of the small-business men not only of my State, but of the entire Nation. Long before I came to the Senate I was familiar with the splendid work of the Small Business Committee, and I was familiar also with how the small-business men throughout the State of Minnesota appreciated what was being done for them by the Small Business Committee. I certainly hope that this committee may continue to function in the same manner in which it functioned during the time it was designated an independent Small Business Committee. So again I say that I commend not only the able Senator from Montana but the junior Senator from Nebraska for having fought for the continuance of the life of the Small Business Committee in order that it may continue to do the splendid work which it has been doing. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his very generous remarks. I think what he has said is absolutely true. I recall many small-business concerns in the State of Minnesota that made splendid contributions to war production during the war. I cannot recall the names now, but I remember one organization in the State of Minnesota which succeeded in taking a subcontract for the manufacture of some materials which were being used in the war, and it cut the price almost in half because of its efficiency.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If time would permit we could certainly go into the splendid record made by the small-business men of Minnesota and of many of the other Northwestern States. They made an excellent contribution in assisting with their subcontracts some of the larger firms in the East and in other industrial sections of the country. They could have accomplished that and fulfilled those contracts only through the assistance of a committee such as the Small Business Committee.

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely correct. There can be no question about it. The committee was responsible in a very large measure for the tremendous volume of production during the war, because we mobilized thousands and thousands of small concerns throughout the United States which would have gone bankrupt if it had not been for the activities of this committee. We held hearings in Washington and in other parts of the country and brought the businessmen before us. We caused the procurement agencies of the Government to set up small-business units in their various departments in order to try to bring these small concerns into successful operation in fighting the war. We had over 2,500 business concerns scattered all over the western part of the United States working, in connection with the Navy, out of Mare Island. The Navy presented its E award to a number of these concerns for the excellence of their work in that regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on Friday last the majority leader said he would yield me 10 minutes, and if the time of the Senator from Montana has expired, I should like to have some time. I wish to discuss for a short time the question now pending before the Senate.

I would not question the sincerity of any Senator who makes an honest effort in behalf of small-business men. I would protest their motives, however, should they prove to be nothing more than a cloak of do-goodism enshrouding base political ambitions. My feelings would be the same regardless of the Senator's party affiliation.

Hear me well, Mr. President and Senators. I know my remarks will not change any votes in this Chamber today, but in anticipation of what is going to take place here at 4 o'clock, there will be a record of my caution which will be of little consolation in the coming congressional elections, and especially in 1952. The vote here this afternoon will not be a record of either political party. It will be a record of politics. The pending proposal is not an attempt to help small business.

I appreciate as much as does any other Senator that the small-business men of the Nation do need help and that it is necessary for them that legislative action be taken by the House and the Senate, but I cannot see how a special committee of the Senate, or an investigating committee, can in any way relieve them from the plight in which they now find themselves.

I am anxious to observe the future voting record of Senators on small-business legislation. I intend to report some legislation from the Banking and Currency Committee which will give the do-gooders a chance to stand up and be counted. It will be before November, too.

The small-business men of this Nation have been so taunted with lip service that they have become calloused to campaign promises. Even Government departments and agencies have failed in their pledges.

I wish to make it clear that many of the bills, amendments, and other measures, intended to relieve small business, have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but that committee has never gotten the proper cooperation from the agencies of the Government. In many instances, they have not even approved of legislative proposals which have been sent to the Senate, and in some instances they even threatened adverse legislation. So, regardless of some of the things we may or may not do in the House or Senate, I say, as Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that, certainly since I have been chairman, we have not received full cooperation from the Government agencies in an effort to help small business, not only through legislation, but in many instances by action taken by the departments. It has been necessary for us to change some of the laws. It was necessary last year, when we were considering the continuance of controls on steel, and continuance of export controls—which we later abolished—on cottonseed, oils, and other commodities affecting many of the small-business interests throughout the country. We did not get proper cooperation from the departmental agencies until after we brought the matters to the floor of the Senate.

On the basis of studies and investigations made by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have been convinced of the necessity of certain legislative action. In deference to adverse reports by some of the departments, committee action was delayed on several bills during the past session. I think the Congress should now have an opportunity either to support this lip service, or brand it for what it is, and offer some practical help.

Now let us have a look at the record of gross inconsistencies. The majority leadership is flip-flopping to the support of a group of well-organized and highly vocal lobbyists who are clamoring for the creation of a special small-business committee. I say that, Mr. President, because I have received telegrams from these lobbyists. I have sent their names to the Secretary's office, where they are supposed to be recorded.

We criticized the Republicans vigorously in the Eightieth Congress for doing this very thing.

In January 1947 when the question of renewing the life of the Small Business Special Committee was before the Senate, administration leaders in this body, with unsurpassed logic, mercilessly flayed the Republican leadership which was attempting to create a special committee. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was then sacred in our administration leaders' eyes.

The then senior Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Hatch, who is now a Federal judge, told this body that he would welcome the opportunity of standing before a court to prove that the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act was to do away with special committees. He pointed out the reason, intelligence and knowledge of the conditions that existed before the Reorganization Act was passed all led to that conclusion. As he stated, "one may argue until he is black in the face that it was not intended to do away with special committees," but the facts are to the contrary.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in its report dealing with the whole subject of congressional reorganization declared:

> We recommend that the practice of creating special committees of investigation be abandoned. (No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess, dated March 4, 1946.)

The La Follette-Monroney bill as passed by the Senate contained this provision in section 126:

> No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or regulation, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

The House deleted that provision from the bill. Representative MONRONEY, who was in charge of the bill in the House, explained that this provision was more suitable for the Senate which was plagued with a great many special committees.

He pointed out further:

> It is a rash that has broken out there which practically destroys the continuity and the power of the standing committees.

The then senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY, arguing in 1947 against the establishment of a special committee, explained as follows the reason why the Senate concurred in 1946 in the House version:

> It (the bill) came back to the Senate when we were on the verge of adjournment, and we almost had to accept the House amendment or get no legislation at all along that line.

Several Members of this body made, in 1947, the most eloquent and convincing arguments that could be presented against the establishment of a special committee on small business. They were convincing because they were true. Thus, the present majority leader then stated:

> I undertake to say that this resolution does violate the spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act.
>
> I do not refer to what was said on the last day of the session, when practically every Member of the Senate had his bags packed, ready to go home. There was not time for debate or even a conference. Senator La Follette accepted the House version in order to get something. But I refer to what was said when this matter was debated at length.
>
> There we find the statements and conclusions which will prove to every reasonable and prudent mind that the spirit of the Senate of the United States on special committees, as expressed at that time, certainly is being violated by these particular resolutions (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Volume 93, part 1, pp. 285, 286.)

Mr. President, those were the resolutions we adopted in 1947. On pages 285 and 286 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, will be found the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], which I have read.

What, then, has happened to our side of the aisle? It is not a question of the job that has been done by the Banking and Currency Committee through its Subcommittee on Small Business. In fact, all references to the subcommittee's work on this floor have been complimentary.

The small-business men who have availed themselves of our services have been most complimentary over the excellence and the thoroughness of our efforts in their behalf. In fact, Fred A. Virkus, chairman, Conference of American Small Business Organizations, recently testified as follows:

> I know this subcommittee and the Banking and Currency Committee are doing a better job for small business than has ever been done before, and personally I should like to see this jurisdiction over small business remain in this committee. (Hearings on Economic Power of Labor Organizations, p. 606.)

What, then, has happened to Members on this side of the aisle? I will tell the Senate what has happened. Members on this side of the aisle are doing precisely what they mercilessly criticized the Members on the other side of the aisle for doing in 1947. We are forgetting logic. We are casting aside the fruit of years of research into the functioning of our legislative process. We are casting into the scrap heap the reforms that flowed from those investigations.

And what will we get from this mess of pottage? We will get the same crop we reaped before the passage of the Reorganization Act. We will get inefficiency, waste, and duplication and confusion. The special committee will issue reams of reports that will be read by but few Senators, as we are all so busy. It will introduce a large number of bills that will be referred mostly to our committee, and in part to others. Our committee will not take the word of others for the existence of the conditions stated, as it is our duty to investigate the facts before legislating. Hence, lengthy duplicate hearings will again be held.

The Rules Committee and the Senate will be called upon to provide even more money so that the staffs of the standing committees may be enlarged in order to keep up with this new mass of recommendations from a committee with no legislative authority of its own.

Mr. President, I would leave the Senators with one further thought. Perhaps it would be well to simply repeal the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Seriously, my colleagues, do not lose sight of the fact that it is our party's duty to adhere to the Reorganization Act. If we do not do so now, let us not weep when there again breaks out a rash of special committees for wool, for mines, for liquor, for gold, and for $3 bills, and for many others.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the absence of the majority leader I will take 10 more minutes.

Before he left, the majority leader told me I could take that much time, if it was necessary for me to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the most important things for Members of this body to consider is the great change that has come over the country as the result of the growth of big business and monopoly, and how it affects small-business concerns. Studies have been made of this situation in our country, and many articles have appeared in magazines and important newspapers dealing with the subject. I recall that back in the depression period it was shown that while all of small business was in a highly competitive situation and was not able to survive in that period, the big-business concerns were able to continue and to make progress, even though the country was in one of the most serious depressions we ever witnessed. All during the depression years the major corporations of the United States made satisfactory profits. In 1937 the major companies of the country made more profits than they did in 1929, which was the highest period of American prosperity. That was due to the fact that they were able to curtail production and raise prices and continue to operate successfully, while all the small-business concerns were in a state of intense competition and were not able to meet the conditions which had come upon them.

Mr. President, I shall refer to an article taken from Fortune magazine of March 1938, in which the situation I have described was discussed. The article shows how American business had changed over the years, and how we were rapidly becoming a collectivist economy in this country. The article says:

> Thus collectivism in industry begets collectivism in government. And if this is not collectivism as practiced in the so-called collectivist states, it is only a couple of theoretic steps removed from it. Carried to its extreme, it means the downfall of the economy upon which American business has been reared; the perversion of the democratic order; the destruction of the right to risk and profit; and—all too easily—the loss of those civil liberties that are at present based upon the principle of the limitation of governmental power.

That article shows what a serious situation is confronting this country, and how important it is for the Senate to set up a special committee which will make small-business problems its chief concern, and work out ways and means of aiding small business to survive in this desperate period. I submit that the matter is very important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement from a book entitled "People and Power," published by William Morrow & Co. of New York, in 1947. The book is written by Harvey Ferguson.

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

> The effort here is to understand the psychology of conservative citizens and it cannot be understood without considering the fact that all of them have lived their whole lives in the world of laissez faire, and that the alternation of boom and slump was typically, for a hundred years, to those who own the means of production, both a means to wealth and a means to power. More individual fortunes have been made by speculation than by production, and speculation depends upon the wide swing in values which only the business cycle can produce. Every great bull market requires first a great bear market where those who have can buy cheap. Every real-estate boom is preceded by a period in which a great deal of real estate passes from the little fellow to the big one. No doubt, every lender hates to foreclose a mortgage, but during the great depression thousands of small property owners were closed out and their holdings were later resold at enormous profits. The business cycle has played an essential part in a process of expropriation which has been concentrating American wealth in fewer and fewer hands for generations. The process is even more deadly to the little entrepreneur than it is to the wage earner, who has nothing to lose but the fat on his ribs. So the defense of free private enterprise, as carried on in the halls and lobbies of Congress by organizations representing vested interest, has, as a matter of fact, been a means of destroying the prime essential of freedom of economic enterprise as a mass condition, for that essential is access to some means of production (Ferguson, Harvey, People and Power, pp. 48–49, William Morrow & Co., New York, 1947).

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I also wish to call attention to the Supreme Court decision in the case of Standard Oil Co. against United States, which was decided on June 13, 1949, in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Douglas. The opinion refers to the concentration of industrial power in the hands of a few. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the opinion may be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

> The increased concentration of industrial power in the hands of a few has changed habits of thought. A new age has been introduced. It is more and more an age of monopoly competition. Monopoly competition is a regime of friendly alliances, of quick and easy accommodation of prices even without the benefit of trade associations, of what Brandeis said was euphemistically called cooperation. While this is not true in all fields, it has become alarmingly apparent in many.
>
> The lessons Brandeis taught on the curse of bigness have largely been forgotten in high places. Size is allowed to become a menace to existing and putative competitors. Price control is allowed to escape the influences of the competitive market and to gravitate into the hands of the few. But beyond all that there is the effect on the community when independents are swallowed up by the trusts and entrepreneurs become employees of absentee owners. Then there is a serious loss in citizenship. Local leadership is diluted.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. May I inquire of the Senator from Montana if from the material he has he can insert something which criticizes the inadequacy of the present Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, in order that independently minded Senators may judge whether or not what we are doing is inadequate for the task of the future, in order that we can give better consideration to the proposal offered by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. Quite naturally, no criticisms have been made by major magazines, because they have never made any study of the subject. I doubt if any of them really know about the activities of the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. Very many businessmen of the country do not know that such a subcommittee exists. Therefore, no public criticism has been made of it. I could not make any criticism of it. I think the subcommittee wants to do the best job it possibly can, but I do not think it is an effective way to meet the problems affecting small business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 52 minutes and the Senator from Nebraska has 46 minutes, the Chair is advised.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield several minutes to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield a portion of my 20 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate now that the small-business men who have availed themselves of our services have been most complimentary over the excellence and thoroughness of our efforts in their behalf. In fact, Mr. Fred A. Virkus, who is chairman of the American Small Business Organizations, recently testified as follows:

> I know this subcommittee and the Banking and Currency Committee are doing a better job for small business than has ever been done before, and personally I should like to see this jurisdiction over small business remain in this committee.

Mr. President, I read that quotation merely because I wanted those who have worked so faithfully on the staff of the committee and the Senators who are members of that committee, and who have given of their time to its work, to have that acknowledgment of the value of their services placed in the RECORD, together with the speech I have made.

I am glad to have heard so many complimentary remarks, even by some Senators who may not be on the floor today, made regarding the work the committee and its staff have done.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Florida understands the situation, he has for his time the remainder of the 20 minutes yielded to him by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and 40 minutes yielded to him by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. President, I do not care to go over the same ground that I covered Friday afternoon in my argument on this subject. However, there are two points which I think need to be accentuated at this stage of the argument, the first of which is to remind Senators—and I wish more Senators were present in the Senate Chamber at this time—that this matter was very fully and ably argued to a conclusion, at least for the time being, in 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, and that the splendid arguments against the setting up of any special committee on

small business, as then suggested by Senate Resolution 20, are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that time, and it seems to me they still very clearly express a conviction on the part of the Democratic majority of this Congress, then the minority of the Eightieth Congress, against the creation of any special committee on small business or any other special committee, as being in contravention of the spirit of the Reorganization Act, and also as not being in accord with the best interests of sound, economical, efficient, and democratic government, here in the Halls of Congress.

I have been impressed today while rereading the arguments presented in the 1947 debate, and I wish time permitted me to read a larger portion of them into the RECORD at this point.

I wish to comment that able Senators, who are still Members of the Senate, took very strong positions against the adoption of the then pending measure, Senate Resolution 20, which was intended to reestablish a special committee on small business. The argument of the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was very compelling on this point. The argument of the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was one of the best I have ever heard him make. The two arguments made by the able senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are full of good meat, and they lead one to the very definite conclusion that it was against the interests of sound and well-organized legislative government to trespass against the spirit of the Reorganization Act by the adoption of a measure to set up a special committee on small business.

The able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] argued the matter with great ability and distinction.

The able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], although he now takes a different position, at that time—as shown by his participation in the argument on several occasions—was strongly of the feeling that the special committee should not be reconstituted or set up again.

The then serving minority leader, Mr. BARKLEY, now the President of the Senate, likewise argued this question exhaustively at that time, and I shall quote briefly from his argument before I conclude my remarks.

The arguments against the setting up the Special Committee on Small Business were not solely heard, however, from Senators on this side of the aisle. On the contrary, two of the ablest arguments were made by Senators who sit upon the other side of the aisle. I refer to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], both of whom made very able arguments against the setting up of a Special Committee on Small Business, against the breaking of the spirit and purpose of the Reorganization Act, and against the kind of confusion which they so ably pointed out would result by having the Senate again embark upon a course of action by which it would set up special committees running across the lines of jurisdiction of the general or standing committees.

Mr. President, I believe every Member of the Senate knows that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is one of the ablest scholars in this body. In his argument at that time, on January 15, 1947, I am impressed with the fact that he approached this question as a scholar, as a student, as one who had participated, as a member of the committee, in the work of the special joint committee from which came, as a result of its labors, the Congressional Reorganization Act. I shall not quote him at great length, but I certainly wish to quote some of the argument he made at that time.

First, in giving the basis upon which he would discuss this subject, he said:

> Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to discuss these questions on the high ground of the basic principles of good legislative organization and administration, without reference to personal ambitions or partisan advantage.

Again, he spoke as follows:

> Speaking both as a close student of representative government and as an experienced practitioner of the political art, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and especially newcomers to the Senate, to consider the issue before us with open minds and with a view to the long-run welfare and repute of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to approach the debate today on that same high plane.

Again, the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] spoke as follows:

> We know that the Congress is not the body to execute, it is not the body to administer; but it is the body to direct. By resort to the expedient of special committees, Congress to a great extent actually loses control because of the independent way in which investigating committees set about and carry on their work without review by a standing committee of the Senate.

Later in his argument the able Senator from Utah adopted the basic arguments as advanced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and quoted them as expressing in large part his position on this very interesting subject. I shall read the points he stated, from 1 to 9, which the senior Senator from Utah stated in the course of his argument as an analysis of his attitude on the question and also of the attitude, in opposition, of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the measure which would have set up a special committee for small business.

The Senator from Utah then said:

> First. The jurisdiction of the standing committees has been so comprehensively described in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. Thus, to create a special committee is to trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee.

How very true that is, Mr. President. The Senator from Utah further said:

> Second. The standing committees of the Senate have been authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act to exercise continuous oversight of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions. They are being equipped with professional staffs and expert investigators to assist them in performing their oversight function and have been armed with the subpena power for this purpose. Hereafter the investigatory function of Congress should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose instead of relying upon special investigating committees which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.
>
> Third. The reformed Senate rules limit Senators to service on two standing committees each so that they can meet their legislative responsibilities more effectively. If, in addition, Senators are appointed to serve on special committees, the burdens of committee work will be correspondingly multiplied and the old evils of poor attendance and scattered attention will return.
>
> Fourth. Creation of one or two special committees now will pave the way for the establishment of a rash of special committees with inevitable duplication of the work of the standing committees and unnecessary large-scale expenditures. It might also lead to a revival of the use of staff personnel borrowed from downtown departments with all the disadvantages of that practice.
>
> Fifth. Creation of special committees to deal with subjects already assigned to standing committees will also be a burden to, and impair the efficiency of, the executive agencies of the Government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of the Senate.
>
> Sixth. Sporadic inquiries by select committees lack continuity and fail to provide the members of standing committees with direct knowledge of the information gathered. In cases where legislative action is indicated, standing committees find it necessary to do much of the work over again.
>
> Seventh. Special investigations should be conducted by subcommittees of the reorganized standing committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter involved. Thus, for example, inquiries into the condition of small business might well be assigned to a standing subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
>
> Eighth. On June 10, 1946, the Senate approved of the ban on special committees by a vote of 49 to 16 in passing the La Follette bill.
>
> Ninth. Modernization of the congressional committee structure, achieved by the Legislative Reorganization Act, was the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. To set up a series of special committees now would be a regressive step that might lead to the ultimate destruction of this fundamental reform.

Following those nine statements of the compelling reasons the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had advanced against setting up special committees—reasons which were adopted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah continued his remarks by making the following statement:

> There is one further argument I should like to add to the cogent statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. While some special committees in the past have been "black sheep," some truly progressive committees in recent years have made a major contribution to public understanding of our economic and social problems. I applaud their achievements. But I say that all the advantages which are claimed for the special committee technique can now be enjoyed by our reorganized and newly staffed standing committees and their subcommittees. Armed with the power of subpena and staffed with expert investigators and empowered to keep constant watch over the activities of the executive agencies within their jurisdiction, there is no reason why our great standing committees of the Senate

should not serve the Congress and the country as well as certain outstanding special committees have done in the past.

That ends my quotation from the remarks made at that time by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], Mr. President.

While I am on this point, though, I should like to put in the RECORD one of the various quotations which might be given from the able arguments of the Senator from Illinois who, as I said a while ago, participated, not once, but several times in the debate, though he now takes the contrary position.

For instance, I quote from page 345 of volume 93, part 1, of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following statement then made by the senior Senator from Illinois:

I am further told that General Gregory appeared one day before a special committee of the Senate and was kept practically all day before that committee giving testimony; that the following day he appeared before another committee of the Senate, giving the same testimony; and the third day he was summoned to the House of Representatives to give the same testimony over there on surplus property. That is an example of what the Senator is talking about—taking the time of important men in the executive branch of the Government of the United States and constantly bringing them before committees to go over the same subject-matter time and time again. If the Reorganization Act functions as the Senate said it should function in the debates we had when we passed the bill, when the time comes for these men from the executive branch of the Government to come to the Hill to testify, they can go before either one full committee or a subcommittee of a full committee. Then we shall eliminate the duplication of effort, waste of time, and waste of manpower which was unavoidable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

I want to reread into the RECORD, as the advice of the Senate at that time, this verdict of the able Senator from Illinois, who then urged:

Then we shall eliminate the duplication of effort, waste of time, and waste of manpower which was unavoidable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois is now of the opinion that some other conclusion was a sound one. However, this is the latest expression of his considered thinking that I have seen, and it is to the effect that duplication of effort, waste of time, waste of manpower, is inevitable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

Mr. President, the able minority leader at that time, now the Vice President, in concluding the argument of this point before the Senate on the occasion which I mentioned used the following words:

Mr. President, in the interest of efficiency, economy, and orderly legislation, it seems to me to be common sense to refer to the committee having jurisdiction of substantive legislation the investigation necessary to bring out the facts which will show what legislation is needed; for, in the absence of legislation, neither the Small Business Committee nor any other committee can for very long do any legislative business or any other kind of business, because we must give our attention to the law, and not to an effort to substitute a committee of Congress for an executive department, whether it be the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, or any other agency which deals with the financial set-up of business whether it be large or small.

I go back to say it seems to me—and I paraphrase the Vice President, then the senior Senator from Kentucky—it seems to me still to be common sense to refer to the committee having jurisdiction of substantive legislation, the investigation necessary to bring out the facts which will show what legislation is needed.

Mr. President, not only was this the position taken by the distinguished leaders on this side of the aisle, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the votes were taken on this measure, it appeared that all but three Members among the Democrats in the Senate at that time voted to stand by their then leader, the then distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky; and also by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, the whip at that time; and that with three exceptions, on both yea-and-nay votes taken on that legislation, first upon the so-called Tobey amendment, and, second, on the adoption of the resolution, there were only three Democrats then sitting in the Senate who did not go with the leadership and with the other leading Democrats, who had voiced their extreme disapproval of the custom and practice of setting up special committees, and of the efficiency of such a system. I may say those three include the senior Senator from Montana, who is consistent in his continued opposition on the floor of the Senate. He is the only one who has been consistent, I may say, and I think, in passing, we should all compliment him upon his consistency. The other two brethren among the Democrats who joined him in 1947 are no longer on the floor of the Senate. They were the then Senator from Texas, Mr. O'Daniel, and the then Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Stewart. So that the only Senator now serving as a Democrat who then took that position is the distinguished Senator from Montana, who quite consistently maintains his position; which, however, flew in the face of the party's position taken by his leadership, and followed by nearly all members of the Democratic minority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator another 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes more.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say I have 40 minutes of the time of the Senator from Nebraska. I do not think the Senator heard me when I made that statement when I started. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator yielded 17 minutes, which expired. There is no record at the desk of the 40 minutes referred to.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Nebraska was called from the Chamber, but he told me before he left to announce that he had yielded me 40 minutes of his time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator has been talking about inconsistency. Does the Senator from Florida believe he has been consistent in connection with this matter?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida thinks he has been entirely consistent, and, since the question has come up, I wonder——

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder whether it might be interesting to read a question which was addressed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] during the course of the debate. If ever inconsistency existed, it is the present announced position of the Senator from Illinois, as contrasted to his position taken in this question. I read the question, further——

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I will gladly yield after I get through reading the question propounded in the debate in 1947 by the senior Senator from Illinois to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in these words:

So that brings me back to the same question—

The Senator from Illinois was talking to the Senator from Michigan—

namely, if the Senator was so determined last year to eliminate special committees, and he voted to do so, and he played a part in doing so by his vote here in the Senate, it is difficult for the Senator from Illinois to understand the change of heart and mind overnight of the able Senator from Michigan.

That is the exact quotation taken from the debate at that time, which might be paraphrased now, to phrase this question addressed to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]: If the Senator was so determined last year to eliminate special committees, which he was, and he voted to do so—and he did—and he played a part in doing so by his vote here in the Senate—which of course is a matter of record—it is difficult for the Senator from Florida to understand the change of heart and mind overnight of the able Senator from Illinois.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida introduced in the Senate a joint resolution cosponsored by the Senator from Nebraska, asking the Senate to create a standing Committee for Small Business. Has not the Senator retreated from that position?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to answer the question. In the first place, the Senator from Nebraska had nothing to do

with the drafting of the joint resolution. It was drawn by the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. HOLLAND. In the next place, the Senator from Florida introduced it, thinking that a standing committee clothed with full authority could best handle the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator has retreated from that position, has he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has retreated, in this respect only——

Mr. LUCAS. Well——

Mr. HOLLAND. And if the distinguished Senator will allow me now to state my position, I think he will have the information he so ardently desires.

Mr. LUCAS. I have been talking about——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not yield until I have answered the question. The fact of the matter is this: The question came up in the caucus of our party, at which time our leader knows full well the majority refused to give to him a verdict on this that he could change his position or change the position of the party, because no such action was taken. But it became clearly apparent to the junior Senator from Florida, as it was to everyone who was there, that the chairmen of the several committees of the Senate were unwilling to accede to the giving of jurisdiction in this matter to a standing committee, because they could not feel at this time that they would know exactly how far it would go, about cutting across lines of their jurisdiction. It became so evident, that the majority of the leaders here on this side, excluding the Senator from Illinois, who, as I recall, made no expression at that time upon the subject, that the majority of the leaders, the chairmen of the committees, were not willing to give their approval, and it became very evident that the resolution as first introduced by me could not pass. Therefore, taking the next best course, he is turning to the Committee on Banking and Currency which has been found by the verdict of the Senate, through a vote of 57 to 20, to be the committee which has dominant jurisdiction in the field of small business; I am trying now to give to the committee not only the legislative authority which it has already, but sufficient investigatorial authority, without disturbing at all their legislative authority, so that they can more effectively cover this particular business; and I may say that in order to have a better tie-in with other committees which have a stake in small business, my proposed amendment suggests that, for instance, a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be assigned as an extra, an added and ex officio member to the Committee on Banking and Currency, on matters affecting small business; likewise, that a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has to do with antitrust legislation, which affects small business so vitally; likewise, a member from the Committee on Finance, which affects all tax matters that bear upon small business; leaving it to five additional committeemen, coming from committees where the best experienced members can be found, in the hope that small business will be better satisfied with that arrangement than it has proved it has been satisfied with the present situation in which a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency has handled the matter.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason the Senator from Illinois rose was to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida with reference to consistency and inconsistency. The Senator made a long speech after I asked him the question. The only thing I am asking is this: Is it not a fact that the Senator has retreated from his previous position, and is that not an inconsistent position?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not in the slightest.

Mr. LUCAS. Why did not the Senator approve the original resolution?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask to be protected against the assaults which are being leveled against me.

Mr. LUCAS. I apologize to the Senator if he thinks I am leveling any assaults against him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I accept the Senator's apology and shall be happy to state my position again, as I stated it on Friday. I should be glad to continue to fight for a standing Small Business Committee with legislative powers to deal with the affairs of small-business men, were that possible. Seeing I cannot get that, I am willing to stand for the next best thing, which is to lodge the jurisdiction in a standing committee, a committee which has the great preponderance of interest in the affairs of small business. The Senator cannot claim that I have abandoned my position, because, to the contrary, I stated on Friday that if I thought there were a chance for the resolution to be adopted, I would support it. I am not guilty of the type of inconsistency displayed by my friend from Illinois, who, after twitting the Senator from Michigan with being inconsistent in having adopted an entirely different position from the one he had taken the year before, now finds that the question be leveled at the Senator from Michigan is when addressed to him now impossible of being answered, because it clearly shows the complete inconsistency of the present position of the Senator from Illinois as measured against his position in 1947, 1948, and 1949.

So, Mr. President, if I may proceed with my statement——

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at the moment. I am operating on limited time. When I finish my statement, if I have any time remaining, I shall be very happy to yield.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield now. I shall be happy to yield when I have concluded my statement.

The first point, Mr. President, is that the majority leader has deserted his party, the shepherd has deserted his flock, and now, in spite of the fact that jurisdiction has been conferred upon another committee, an excellent committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, to do the job, and it has been trying to do it, the Senator wants to establish a duplicate authority, a special committee on small business, to interfere with and encumber the work and the labors now being performed by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

That brings me, Mr. President, to the second part of my remarks, and I ask that Senators follow them very closely.

In February 1949, the Senate ruled that the Committee on Banking and Currency had the predominant jurisdiction over legislation affecting small business. A little bit later, on May 6, 1949, the Senate adopted Senate resolution 101 which following out the decision already made by the Senate as to where the major jurisdiction lay, turned over to the Banking and Currency Committee not any additional legislative jurisdiction, because that was carefully safeguarded under an amendment offered by my friend, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], whom I see here, but full investigative duties and functions. That resolution, which was agreed to on May 6, 1949, was the verdict of the Democratic Senate to the effect that that committee was the proper place in which such an investigation should take place.

Mr. President, I want to read into the RECORD at this time, in order that it may be crystal clear that what we did was done by deliberation and was done in such a way as to really vest investigative authority in the Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Resolution 101:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the Eighty-first Congress, until February 15, 1950, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper, relating to small business, including (A) problems threatening the continued existence of small business enterprises, (B) financial aid to small business enterprises, (C) financial aid to veterans operating small business enterprises, and (D) adequacy of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authority and extensions thereof.

Further, Mr. President, the budget attached to the report on the resolution showed $30,000 out of a total of $60,000 appropriated out of the contingent fund of the Senate was earmarked to serve in this investigation in the field of small business. Not only was that action taken on May 6, 1949, but in this particular year, on February 9, Senate Resolution 218 came on to be acted upon, and it proposed that the authority of the Banking and Currency Committee and its subcommittee, as provided for in Senate Resolution 101, be continued until February 15, 1951.

Mr. President, not only was that done through the passage of the resolution, but if Senators will take the time to refer to the report attached thereto, they will find that a substantial additional sum of money was assigned to small-business investigations, raising the figure from $30,000 to approximately $45,000, to be expended in the investigations for the protection of small business. The report shows that antitrust litigation has al-

ready been brought in pursuance of some of the committee's recommendations. It shows that the committee has effectively served small business in many particulars, and the testimony filed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, shows the approving reaction of various small-business men and small-business groups to the type of service which the committee has rendered.

But the point I am making, Mr. President, is that the Senate has acted. It acted last year and again this year, and has committed itself until February 15, 1951, to a course of investigation of the affairs of small business which is now being conducted by a highly trained and extensive staff, with all the facilities needed, and it is going on regardless of whether the Senate shall look with approval upon the suggestions made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. Regardless of whether their suggestions shall prevail, that activity will continue until February 15, 1951.

What a request to make to the Senate of the United States, when we are all economy-minded. What a request to make to the Senate of the United States to slap at a good committee which is rendering good service in the performance of a direction given to it by the whole body of the Senate, and to try to establish a special committee—whether standing or for the length of the session makes no difference—with authority to investigate the same field, with the necessity of establishing a new staff and providing for new expenditures, and of duplicating the whole field of service. I cannot believe that my friends, the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Nebraska, who have made contrasting suggestions and who, I understand, will offer substitutes, have really thought through the position in which they would put the Senate of the United States if their suggestions should prevail, and if, instead of having a single duly constituted authority to represent the Senate in the investigation of small-business matters, we establish an additional one. We would have a second horn of the dilemma, with conflicting and competing staffs and expenditures. They have suggested something which is nothing more nor less than duplication and which seeks to do nothing more nor less than to give affront to a committee which I think has rendered good service.

For the information of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] I say that that committee should have full authority, but it does not have it because we cannot give new legislative authority to standing committees because of the attitude in the Senate at this time. So, the best we can do is to give it investigative authority——

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

Mr. HOLLAND. In just a moment, please.

I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. I was a member of the Small Business Committee for 2 years. I found it was helpless to function properly because it had no legislative authority. It was completely emasculated as to any authority which any committee needs to carry through its recommendations and convictions. Therefore, what I shall say with reference to the Banking and Currency Committee is not a personal matter in any way, but I heard suggestions made on the floor of the Senate on Friday to the effect that small-business men felt they were going before a group of glassy-eyed bankers when they came before the members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, the members of that committee are Members of the Senate, just as are the rest of us who are assigned to other committees. It so happens, whether our friends who made the suggestion realize it or not, that the membership of the Banking and Currency Committee very peculiarly falls within the group of Senators which has shown the greatest sympathy for the problems of small business. For instance, there are three members of the Banking and Currency Committee who were members of the Special Small Business Committee, namely, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. In addition to those, there are two members of that committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who by their unyielding attitude in the protection of small business with reference to the basing-point bill, Senate bill 1008, have won the particular esteem and affection of the small business groups of this Nation. Yet it is suggested that in the Banking and Currency Committee there is an unsympathetic background for the rendition of real service to small business.

I could continue with my reference to the members of the special committee. For instance, there is the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], whose kindly, sympathetic attitude toward small business has marked everything he has done since he came to the Senate. There is the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is even now conducting an investigation in an effort to make the RFC more sympathetic in its consideration of loans requested by small business.

Mr. President, we can look at the whole membership of that committee. I apologize because time does not permit my mentioning the other members. Every member of that committee should be an acceptable person to small business for the handling of its complaints and consideration of its legitimate needs. So it seems to me, Mr. President, we should not be doing something which would seem rather ridiculous in the present state of our economy and in the present state of our overwork. To assign a new group of 12 or 13 Senators to handle what would not only be a new field of activity for them, but a duplicate field of Senate activity, deprived of any legislative power at all, needing a new staff, with new expenditures, with all the organizational work which would be entailed, would be a complete disservice to small business, and a complete disservice to the Members of the Senate who would be called to that new responsibility.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Florida to point out that under the Reorganization Act the Banking and Currency Committee has jurisdiction in that field?

Mr. HOLLAND. It has a large part of the jurisdiction. The Senate decided, by upholding the ruling of the Chair, that the committee has the dominant jurisdiction in the field of small business.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that the Reorganization Act outlaws special committees of the type here under discussion?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Banking and Currency Committee has set up a subcommittee, with a technical staff, which is successfully functioning, and doing its work in an economical way.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my belief.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And under the so-called Murray plan there would be set up a new and competing committee, with authority to hold hearings in Washington and elsewhere in the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, and with authority to subpena witnesses and books, wherever they held hearings, in complete duplication and competition with the efforts of the Banking and Currency Committee, at least until February 15 of next year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Neither of the distinguished sponsors of the proposed legislation has told us what their committee would cost in the event their proposed resolution were adopted. I assume it would be not less than $150,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would not assume that, but I have noticed the reticence of the distinguished sponsors in that particular regard.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Florida is proposing now to give a little further coverage, in line with the precedent already established, under which we bring, from the Committee on Armed Services, or from the Committee on Public Works, or from some other committee, ex officio members into the Appropriations Committee when it has before it a bill dealing with a subject in the jurisdiction of one of those committees.

Mr. HOLLAND. I pointed out in my argument on Friday that we would be following exactly the same course which we are following with such distinct success in the functioning of the Committee on Appropriations. We realize that the members of the Committee on Public Works have a background and knowledge concerning public works which have been authorized, and three members become ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations when the committee is considering appropriations for public works. Similarly in the field of agriculture, in the field of armed services, and in other fields.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and

Currency, but I believe that the subcommittee is composed of as fine members as there are in the Senate. I have no objection at all to the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Florida to add, when some particular subject is under consideration, an additional five ex officio members, and I shall support the Senator in that amendment. I certainly hope that the other amendments will not be adopted, because I do not see how anyone who has sat on this floor and has spoken for economy and efficiency in business, as I have, can vote to set up two committees to do the same thing, with overlapping expenses, and with no assurance that the second committee will be as good as the one we have

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I merely wish to thank the Senator for his remarks with reference to my consistency. If the Senate had been equally consistent in handling this matter, we would not now have this problem before us. We would have kept the Committee on Small Business in operation. It was doing a splendid job. Its termination was a great disappointment to every businessman in the United States. If there is any merit to consistency, I think we should have been consistent and kept that committee in existence. It is proposed now to have members representing five different standing committees participate with the Banking and Currency Committee in matters involving small-business problems. May I ask the distinguished Senator whether that would include the Committeee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. HOLLAND. It may. As I stated on Friday—and I believe the Senator remembers my statement—I suggested that three of the additional members should come, one each from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from the Committee on Finance, and from the Committee on the Judiciary, which latter committee is charged with the consideration of antitrust matters. As to the two additional members, I did not suggest from what committees they should come, because I think there are exceedingly able junior Senators who do not have heavy committee assignments, who may well be assigned to that committee. I should like to mention the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] as fulfilling that description. I had previously talked to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and he said that that part of my suggestion was an excellent one, because he felt there were some Senators on his side of the aisle whose success in business was outstanding, and who could make real contributions in this field. I should state, however, that the Senator did not agree with other portions of my suggestion.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator with respect to new Members of the Senate, who would be very competent and able. In fact, I can think of no Member of the Senate who is better informed on small business problems than the new junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and if any committee is set up, I should like to see him serve on the committee. But I insist that the program the Senator from Florida offers is not a satisfactory program. I do not think it would operate in a satisfactory manner, but that it would lead to confusion. It would require an amendment to the rules of the Senate, and it would change the situation completely. Other committees would have a perfect right to come before this body and insist on a similar program for their committees with reference to some other segment of our economic problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with all due deference to the Senator, I yielded for a question, and I should appreciate a question from him, if he has one.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Florida take the position now that the present Reorganization Act does not prohibit the creation of a special committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not technically, no. The Senate voted to prohibit the creation of special committees. In the last minute work upon the bill in conference the Senate conferees had to yield to the House, but the vote on the floor of the Senate, by an overwhelming majority, showed what the attitude of the Senate was. I pointed out, before the Senator returned to the floor, that so far as the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle were concerned in 1947, with the exception of three, only one of whom is now a Member of the Senate, the argument made by our distinguished leader, the Senator from Illinois, and by his predecessor, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, now the Vice President, was so completely conclusive that as one man we marched down the bill behind them, save for the one exception whom I have already named.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. But it is a fact that the Senate by an overwhelming majority approved the conference report, which certainly took out the provision which the Senate had placed in the bill in its original consideration under which special committees could have been created by the Senate. I desire to get the RECORD clear. I should like to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, except that he fails to recognize the impelling difficulty of the situation. I read now from the argument of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on that point. He said in 1947:

> It is an erroneous interpretation of what happened on that occasion to say that in the Legislative Reorganization Act Congress expressly refused to abolish special committees. We yielded to a parliamentary situation. We have not changed our minds.

He had shown in great detail that the mind of the Senate had been expressed on the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I submit to the distinguished Senator, who is always so just and fair, that the Senator from Utah yielded to his interpretation, but if the record is to be cleared up, it will be found that the Senate overwhelmingly, I think unanimously, if I remember correctly, adopted the conference report after it had considered its position, when the matter was debated on the floor of the Senate. The conference report provided that the position of the House be accepted, which meant that the Senate or the House could create special committees if not in violation of the Reorganization Act. Is not that true?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in this much of his statement, that the Members of the Senate, with their bags packed, ready to catch their trains—as is shown in the argument in the RECORD—voted for the reorganization bill as it came out of conference merely because they desired a reorganization bill, and they wanted the other good things in the bill, although, as stated time and time again by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and other Senators who opposed the provision they by no means gave up, as an objective, the effort to prevent the creation of other special committees; and that they by all means felt that the Senate had, in a direct vote on the question, expressed its views, which were that special committees were a harmful growth upon the body legislative and should be eliminated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked a question which the Senator has answered. Will the Senator now yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. The conference report was adopted after the original bill was passed by the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And the adoption of the conference report is what governs. Whether Senators had their hats in hand and their grips by their sides and were ready to leave is beside the question. If they did not want to adopt the conference report, knowing that the adoption of the report would perhaps mean the creation of special committees, they could have placed their hats on the racks and their suitcases in the cloak rooms and come back and further debated the question. We cannot go back on the final action, which was adoption of the conference report. We cannot go back of that, to the original vote of the Senate on the bill, and say that controls, because the Senate adopted the conference report, and did so on this floor with the full knowledge that by doing so, by acquiescing in the position of the House, either the Senate or the House could create a special committee in the future, if it chose to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska is technically correct. Of course, the Senate was then practical, just as the Senator from

Florida seeks to be practical in not insisting upon the amendment originally offered, in which the Senator from Nebraska was kind enough to join him. I notice the Senator from Nebraska also has moved away from that proposal because he does not feel he can get what was first proposed. So we are trying to secure the best we can. That does not mean we are not in favor of the original proposal, and I believe the Senator from Nebraska will be the first to agree with me.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask the Senator this question: Is it not a fact that it has been my position all along that I felt that a special committee, either without or with legislative authority, should be set up in the United States Senate, and that we should determine that matter once and for all? If the Senate fails to do that, then has it not also been my contention that if the Senate fails to do that that I have approved each and every measure that has come before the Senate to establish small-business committees, or subcommittees on small business in the regular committees? Has that not been my position?

Mr. HOLLAND. I rather think it has been. At any rate the Senator has said what I wanted him to say, namely, that he would still stand for Senate Resolution 58, just as the sponsors and proponents of the Reorganization Act are still for the elimination of the special committees, for the very reasons stated in their reports, for the reasons that were so impressive that an overwhelming majority of the Senate voted for that particular provision of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to take the time of the able Senator in discussing his own amendment to Senate Resolution 58, but if the Senator will further yield, I shall ask one more question: Does the Senator feel—knowing how just and fair the Senator from Florida is, and the junior Senator from Nebraska stated on Friday that if there was anyone in the Senate who was to select the committees from which the ex officio members would be chosen, the Senator from Nebraska knows of no other Senator he would rather have choose them than the junior Senator from Florida. But does the Senator from Florida feel that he can select, as among the committees themselves, which one is more important than the other, among Finance, Judiciary, Rules and Administration, and so forth? Matters come before the Committee on Rules and Administration which affect small business. The same is true respecting other committees. Which committee would the Senator choose above other committees? And after the Senator has chosen such a committee, what member of that committee is the Senator going to choose? The minority side is limited to membership from only two major committees. Younger members of the committee would be blocked, because senior Members would be chosen. While there are many younger Members who could render efficient service, they would not be chosen as members from two of the major committees. However, younger members of committees could serve on a special committee, regardless of their membership on other committees.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that it is my understanding, from the Legislative Reference Service, that the ex officio members will not find themselves deprived of any other major committee assignments, but that to the contrary, if provision be made for ex officio membership on a standing committee the reorganization measure itself provides for no such decision as the Senator mentions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not understand the authority from which the Senator quoted. My understanding is that there would be no restriction with respect to appointment of membership to a special committee, but that with respect to appointing Members to a subcommittee of a standing committee the question will at least arise as to whether a Member can serve on two major committees and also serve on the subcommittee of another committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my understanding that the ex officio members created not by the statute but by a rule of the Senate would not be subjected in any way to that embarrassment or to that rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that every time the question of an appointment comes up a senior member of a committee really receives the appointment, rather than a new member.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that would be a matter wholly for discussion on his side of the aisle as to his two additional Members and on this side of the aisle at to the three additional Members from this side. I am quite willing to leave in the judgment of the Vice President, the presiding officer of this body, and in the judgment of the steering committees of the two sides, to pick the Senator who will be really helpful to small business from the sources provided in the resolution.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I would completely agree with that statement except that it is unfortunate to have a restriction which would prevent new Members of the Senate who are on major committees, who might otherwise serve if a special committee were reconstituted, and where their services would be so valuable.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would thoroughly agree with the Senator if the amendment I propose would accomplish that, but it would not. It would give complete latitude as to the naming of the three members from three standing committees, and even junior members could be chosen; and it would have no limitation at all as to where the two other members could be found. The Senator from Florida further said that he felt that by all means the junior Senator from Connecticut should be added from this side because of his outstanding and successful experience in the field of small business.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that if the Committee on Banking and Currency is expanded—and, by the way, I want to say now that I would just as soon that committee should handle small-business problems as any other committee in the United States Senate, for I have complete respect for that committee—but if it is to be expanded under the authority proposed by the Senator from Florida, first, to have expanded investigative authority, and then have ex officio members voting on the legislative authority—I ask the Senator this question: Would it not override the jurisdiction of other standing committees? Would it not override the amendment the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] succeeded in placing in Senate Resolution 110 whereby it was proposed by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that the subcommittee of that committee was not to invade the jurisdiction of this committee? I ask the Senator, how will the chairman of that subcommittee know when it would, by its action, exceed its authority, and when it would not exceed its authority and jurisdiction?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would remind the Senator from Nebraska that Senate Resolution 101 would not be changed in that regard at all. The original amendment placed in that resolution on motion by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] would remain in it. There is not the slightest question in my proposal of breaking into the legislative jurisdiction of any committee. I would say also to my friend from Nebraska that Senate Resolution 101 already gives to the Committee on Banking and Currency very full jurisdiction so far as investigation only is concerned. I read again—I read this into the RECORD in the absence of the Senator from Nebraska a few minutes ago—that part of the measure which deals with jurisdiction conferred upon the Committee on Banking and Currency solely with reference to small business:

> To make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to * * * (2) small business, including (A) problems threatening the continued existence of small-business enterprises, (B) financial aid to small-business enterprises, (C) financial aid to veterans operating small-business enterprises, and (D) adequacy of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authority and extensions thereof.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, is the Senator not asking the same expanded authority, so far as investigations are concerned and other provisions which the Senator is denying to a special committee? It seems to me the very arguments the distinguished Senator is making in behalf of expanded authority for

the Committee on Banking and Currency is the reason why the Senator is opposed to a special committee. The Senator would give to the subcommittee, so far as investigation is concerned, the same authority, unlimited practically, that the distinguished Senator from Montana and the junior Senator from Nebraska are asking for under a special committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that we are not giving it to them. We gave it to them last year. We extended it to them by action this year. We will simply recognize the status quo and vest in the same good committee which now has that jurisdiction, and which was given the money to carry forward the investigation until February 15 next year, a representation coming from other committees and from other Members of the Senate, so as to make them more satisfactory to the feeling that small business would like to have, that that committee is representative of all trends of thought in the Senate.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why not give a special committee the same authority it is proposed to give the subcommittee, and let that special committee which crosses all lines of legislative committees, have that jurisdiction over investigation, and not give them legislative authority, and then there will be an ideal committee to go clear across the lines, not limiting it to a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, the Committee on Banking and Currency has already dominant jurisdiction, and it has so been held by the ruling of the President of the Senate, and by the vote of the Senate in this field of small business, so that there would be a relatively large number of those studies made as an investigatorial body which it might translate into legislation.

My second point is that I feel that the attitude of small business in wanting a more generally named committee coming from all the portions of the Senate should be recognized.

My third point is this, and I ask the able and economically minded Senator from Nebraska particularly to let me know his answer to this point. His proposal and that of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] both simply offer from now until February 15, 1951, to set up a duplicating committee so far as investigatorial powers are concerned because the power has been given, and it is extended until that date by vote of the Senate, to the Banking and Currency Committee to make investigations in a very full and complete manner.

I am wondering how the Senator from Nebraska, with his well-known feeling that we should economize both as regards the time of the Senate and the spending of the money of the taxpayers of the United States, justifies his present feeling that a new special committee, requiring a new staff and new expenditures, and requiring a certain amount of the time of Senators, whose time is not now so employed, be set up, not to take the place of the Banking and Currency Committee or its subcommittee, but between now and February 15, 1951, to be completely a duplicate body to that already set up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Florida asking me the question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; and I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska, to permit him to reply.

Mr. WHERRY. In reply to the Senator's question, let me say that, to begin with, I feel that the Committee on Small Business should be a permanent committee without legislative authority. We might just as well settle that issue now, once and for all, and not have this question recur at each session of Congress. In view of that fact, it would not make any difference whether we established a special committee on this subject, because the special committee would go into the questions within its jurisdiction. That is point No. 1.

If there were any overlapping of jurisdiction at all for a period of 3 or 4 or 5 months, it would not be nearly so costly as it would be if it began at the beginning of the session commencing with the next Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am disappointed in the statement of the Senator from Nebraska as to his No. 1 reason, because I had understood him to take the position that the junior Senator from Florida takes, namely, that we would wish to have a standing committee with legislative power appointed, rather than a standing committee without legislative power.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall vote for either one or the other. I should like to have a permanent standing committee with legislative authority; but if I cannot have that, I shall do then just what the Senator from Florida will do, namely, I will get the best I can.

So if I cannot obtain the establishment of a standing committee on the subject, with legislative authority, I am perfectly willing to have a permanent committee without legislative authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the statement has been repeatedly made on the floor of the Senate, during the debate, that the Banking and Currency Committee has the major jurisdiction over problems affecting small business. That simply is not so.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. An hour or so ago, when I had a short colloquy with the Senator from Montana, I understood him to say that the decision of the Senate that the Banking and Currency Committee had major jurisdiction over the problems of American small business was not correct in the opinion of the Senator from Montana. Let me ask whether the Senator from Montana intends to enlarge upon that premise?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I intend to enlarge upon it, and I shall show why that committee does not have major jurisdiction in that field.

Mr. President, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, part 1, Standing Rules of the Senate, the Banking and Currency Committee has no legislative power over matters relating to the following subjects, all of which affect small business:

First. Agriculture generally.

Second. Inspection of livestock and meat products.

Third. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

Fourth. Dairy industry.

Fifth. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

All these are under the Committee on Agriculture, and affect the meat-packing industry, including small meat packers all over the country, in whom we are greatly interested. They have appeared on many occasions before the special committee.

They also affect the supply of sugar to soft-drink bottling industry under the Sugar Act of 1948, the fertilizer industry, agricultural and industrial chemical industry, the dairy industry, the insecticide industry, the wholesale and retail agricultural produce business.

Sixth. The Department of Defense—Army, Navy, Air Force.

Seventh. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense. Both the above are under the Committee on Armed Services, and affect military procurement of all kinds, including mineral products.

Eighth. The postal service generally.

Ninth. Census and the collection of statistics generally. Both of these under the Committee on Civil Service, and affecting postage rates and their effect on small-newspaper publishers, also direct-by-mail advertising concerns, and the competition of mail-order houses with small merchants; collection of statistics useful to small-business concerns.

Tenth. Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency. These are under the Committee on Expenditures and affect procurement policies and practices of civilian agencies and departments of the Government.

Eleventh. Revenue measures generally.

Twelfth. Reciprocal trade agreements.

Thirteenth. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.

Fourteenth. National social security. All these are under the Committee on Finance, and affect directly or indirectly every small-business concern in the United States.

Fifteenth. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad. These are under the Committee on Foreign Relations, and affect directly every American small-business concern engaged in foreign commerce.

Sixteenth. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

Seventeenth. Regulation of interstate railroads, busses, trucks, and pipe lines.

Eighteenth. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

Nineteenth. Civil aeronautics.

Twentieth. Merchant marine generally.

Twenty-first. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water.

Twenty-second. Bureau of Standards.

All these are under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and affect—

Freight rates and shipping regulations.

Small bus, truck, and pipe-line operators.

Independent operators of radio and television stations.

Thousands of small-business men engaged in the aviation industry.

Small ship owners.

Scientific and technological aid to small business.

Twenty-third. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies—the greatest problem confronting small business.

Twenty-fourth. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

These are under the Committee on the Judiciary, and affect directly or indirectly every small-business concern in the United States.

Twenty-fifth. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally.

Twenty-sixth. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

Twenty-seventh. Wages and hours of labor.

Twenty-eighth. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

Twenty-ninth. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

Thirtieth. Child labor.

Thirty-first. Labor statistics.

Thirty-second. Labor standards.

All these are under the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and affect directly or indirectly every small business in the United States.

Thirty-third. Mineral resources of the public lands.

Thirty-fourth. Mining interests generally.

Thirty-fifth. Mineral-land laws and claims and entries thereunder. All these are under the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and affect directly every small-mine operator in the country, every small-petroleum producer.

Thirty-sixth. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

Thirty-seventh. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams.

Thirty-eighth. Water power.

Thirty-ninth. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

Fortieth. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads. All these are under the Committee on Public Works, and affect, among other things, development of our natural resources and consequent economic expansion in all fields of independent enterprise.

Mr. President, I submit that, even under the most liberal interpretation of the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Banking and Currency is powerless to legislate on any of the above 40 subjects affecting small business.

If a standing committee were established, as has been debated here this afternoon, selection of members to serve on this committee would be governed by the seniority system, as has already been explained by the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in the course of his remarks. Senators with the highest seniority would have the right to be appointed to this committee, and many junior Senators who are intensely interested in the problems of small business would not have an opportunity to serve on it.

Mr. President, I submit that the major jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee has to do with permanent plans for loans and risk capital. That is the principal jurisdiction possessed by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The next important problem of small business is a long-range research and educational program. That comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The next one, of course, is monopoly and fair-trade practices, which come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. So, Mr. President, it appears to me that it is very clear that the Banking and Currency Committee does not have jurisdiction over 80 or 90 percent of the problems of small business in this country. In fact, it has a very limited jurisdiction over the problems of small business.

I agree with the minority leader when he says that the only effective and efficient procedure is to provide for the appointment of a special committee. Of course I should like to see a permanent committee appointed, if it were possible to do so; but that is not possible; I do not think the Senate would vote to do so at the present time.

Therefore, I am supporting a program for a special committee which will continue during the remainder of the Eighty-first Congress and during the Eighty-second Congress. Then, at the expiration of that period, we can finally determine whether we should have a permanent standing committee on the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me inquire how much time remains.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has 6 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Illinois has the remainder of the time, roughly 19 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall take 15 minutes of my time to discuss this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. First, Mr. President, I should like to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington. Earlier he requested that I do so. I now yield 3 minutes to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Illinois. It seems apparent to the junior Senator from Washington that too little consideration has been given this afternoon to the important work which has been accomplished and undertaken since its inception by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. As but one typical bit of evidence regarding the excellence and character of the work of the subcommittee, I should like to offer for consideration by all Senators and small-business interests and concerns generally, certain remarks contained in a letter dated January 13, 1950, addresesd to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], by Henry Scharf, publisher for Trilane Associations, Inc., an organization devoted to accurate, factual reporting of Government procurement.

In part, the letter has this to say:

> The recent Munitions Board resolution approved by Secretary Johnson January 6, 1950 is now a matter of public record.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Your Small Business Subcommittee has indeed in this instance rendered the greatest service to American business since the inception of the procurement program. I am sure that your files will disclose hundreds of letters from manufacturers seeking Government business and encountering smokescreens of secrecy around public information. The wording of the resolution will now dispel all the restrictive conditions that had unnecessarily prevailed heretofore.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The patient and conscientious work of your Small Business Subcommittee indeed deserves recognition since without their efforts the original resolution of the Board, dated October 20, would have without a question been implemented. It would have virtually destroyed the meaning of broad procurement information.
>
> I personally know of the many obstacles that your committee encountered and Mr. Stewart's diplomacy and diligence was indeed a very decisive factor in bringing about—in the words of Admiral Ring—"a major victory."

Mr. President, for the reason that I think all Senators will be interested in the full text of the letter, I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks at this point.

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

JANUARY 13, 1950.

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: The recent Munitions Board resolution approved by Secretary JOHNSON January 6, 1950, is now a matter of public record.

All the work that went into bringing this resolution about is little known indeed, nor for that matter is the full significance of the resolution itself.

Your Small Business Subcommittee has indeed in this instance rendered the greatest service to American business since the inception of the procurement program. I am sure that your files will disclose hundreds of letters from manufacturers seeking Government business and encountering smokescreens of secrecy around public information. The wording of the resolution will now dispel all the restrictive conditions that had unnecessarily prevailed heretofore.

For ourselves it of course has accomplished fully its objective. By being able to obtain

all the information on Government procurement we can now keep manufacturers and dealers in every part of the country fully informed as to the Government's needs. It will remove many hardships that have heretofore existed.

It is sincerely hoped that the final implementation of this resolution will uphold the broad outlines of the resolution itself.

The patient and conscientious work of your Small Business Subcommittee indeed deserves recognition since without their efforts the original resolution of the Board, dated October 20, would have without a question been implemented. It would have virtually destroyed the meaning of broad procurement information.

I personally know of the many obstacles that your committee encountered and Mr. Stewart's diplomacy and diligence was indeed a very decisive factor in bringing about—in the words of Admiral Ring—"a major victory."

The prompt action by Mr. Lee Parsons indeed dispels any false impressions the public may have of lengthy time intervals prior to any positive action.

From long past experience we have no doubts but that this action will result in more bidders for the Government and I am confident that the lower prices thus obtained will probably save the Government many, many times the cost of your subcommittee.

For ourselves and for all the many subscribers who depend upon accurate and timely procurement information throughout the country, we would like to express to you our sincerest appreciation for a job well done.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY SCHARF,
Publisher for Trilane Associates, Inc.

Mr. CAIN. I again wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Illinois for permitting me to employ several minutes of his time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I did not expect to speak upon the pending question, but in view of the statement made by my very distinguished colleague from Florida in regards to my position on small business at a previous time in the United States Senate, I feel I am justified in saying a word or two. The problem before us is not a question of whether the Senator from Illinois has been consistent or has been inconsistent about a small business committee. The Senator from Florida, as a general rule, is very persuasive in his incontestable logic which he presents to the Senate upon any matter in which he is interested. But in his argument on the pending question, the Senator apparently took a great deal of time and some glee in quoting what the Senator from Illinois said 2 years ago, which is perfectly all right with me, but it has nothing to do with whether we are to have a small business committee either as a temporary or a permanent organization, or whether we are to have a permanent small business committee without legislative functions.

So it seems to me the argument advanced by my distinguished friend is far from the mark. Yet he uses what he calls my inconsistency as an argument, while he proclaims to all the world that he is very consistent in his position, although, had it not been for the Senator from Illinois, along with my good friend from Nebraska, we probably should not be debating the bill today. It was the Senator from Florida, according to what the Senator from Nebraska has said, who made the first mention of the standing permanent committee for small business. These two very able Senators in fact joined in a resolution to set up a permanent small business committee. When the time came to debate this very important issue, with all due deference to both of my good friends, they both vacated and abandoned the strong position they had taken on a permanent standing committee of the Senate; not because of any logic back of this change of heart, but merely for political expediency—in order to try to win a victory. That is practically what the Senator from Florida said when he stated that he got into a conference and found the chairman of the committee against the standing permanent small business committee, because it cut across so many jurisdictional lines of other standing committees. He, of course, is right about that. But these distinguished Senators did not give much thought to that in the beginning, when they came forward with the resolution seeking to set up a permanent standing committee for small business.

I presume, Mr. President, that when the time came to debate the issue, they would stand firmly behind this proposal. But, no, the Senator from Florida did not do so. He has another proposition by way of an amendment which is going to give more power to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and provide greater membership to the committee. He does not like that idea at all, but because he cannot win on his original proposition, he now is adopting the expedient method of trying to convince the Senate that it should go along with a resolution of this kind.

Mr. President, it is not the kind of resolution that ought to be passed. The Senator from Florida is wholly inconsistent in now attempting to do something entirely different from what he sought to do when he attached his name to the resolution. Yet he tells me, in all good faith, that he is absolutely consistent. It is a little difficult for me to understand how a Senator can stand on the floor, after he has abandoned his previous position entirely, and say, "I do not want a standing committee on small business for the United States Senate. I want it to go back to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but I want to add several members to the committee."

In the colloquy I had with the Senator the other day, I asked him, "Who on the Committee on Banking and Currency is to determine what is small business?" His reply was, "The chairman of the committee will make the determination of what is small business."

Mr. President, nothing at all will be accomplished by the proposal of the Senator from Florida. No one has more respect for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency than has the Senator from Illinois; but the chairman is to have power to say to his committee what is small business. When he makes the determination, he is then going to notify the members of other standing committees who are to be appointed by the Vice President, "We have a matter of small business before our committee this morning, and we invite you to sit in as ex officio members to help us make a decision." Mr. President, busy as we are, how many Senators from various other committees appointed to sit in with a committee of that kind to talk about small-business matters will attend? Mr. President, they will not go.

If we are to have a small-business committee of any kind, it ought to be left exactly as it is, with the Committee on Banking and Currency, without any additional members whatever. No additional members are needed, if it is left where it is. If that is not to be done, the work should be turned back to a special committee, without legislative functions, as it was handled in years gone by.

Mr. President, in the beginning of the discussion of small business in the Senate, when the war was going on, the Senator from Illinois, chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported resolutions appropriating $380,000, which was spent by the Special Small-Business Committee during those 5 or 6 years for the benefit of small business.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have much time, but I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to remind the Senator that I happened to be a member of his Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate during those years, and what he has said about the expenditure of $380,000 is absolutely correct. But, in addition to that, until the Reorganization Act was passed, the Committee on Small Business and the other special committees had hundreds of thousands of dollars. Numerous Government employees from different departments also worked on the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. After the passage of the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend, I have only a few minutes. After the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed, the Senator from Illinois tried to live up to the letter and spirit of the act, by voting against special committees. The Reorganization Act is plain on that score; it outlaws special committees. But the Reorganization Act has been violated many times since then.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not disagree with what the Senator has said up to this point. But the legislative Reorganization Act does not outlaw special committees.

Mr. LUCAS. I was under the impression it did. I still think it did. I took that position at the time. But, anyway——

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question, since I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder whether the Senator has any explanation for the Senate as to why, by supporting the resolution of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], he wants to establish a duplicate agency to that now functioning in the Banking and Currency Committee through the action of the Senate and which is financed until February 15, 1951.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida is the one who started this entire controversy. It was not the Senator from Illinois who started it. The Senator from Florida was not satisfied, apparently, either with the Small Business Committee which had functioned with the Senator from Montana at the head of it, or with the subcommittee functioning through the Banking and Currency Committee. The Senator from Florida is the one who is responsible for bringing in a resolution seeking to make it a standing, permanent committee. So the Senator should not ask me that kind of a question. The Senator from Florida is responsible for our being here at this particular time. He was not satisfied with either arrangement. He wanted a permanent standing committee so that small business would have a better opportunity to be served. He thought that was the better method. Other Senators did not think so. I did not think so, and the Senator from Florida does not think so at the present time, because he has completely abandoned his original position and now seeks to keep the Committee on Banking and Currency as the committee functioning for small business by adding five or six Senators from other committees, which does not mean a single thing. It is the most useless and futile resolution I have heard debated for a long time.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has sought to aid small business through a special committee for a period of 2 years. That is the way it was operated all through the years when the small-business committee was functioning. We had more standing committees when the small-business committee was a special committee than we have at the present time.

I say, Mr. President, there is a need for a committee of some kind that will work effectively in attempting to solve the problems of small business throughout the Nation. I do not say that the Banking and Currency Committee, through its subcommittee, has not done a fair job, but there is a constant effort on the part of persons on the outside, who are interested in small business, as well as on the part of a number of Senators, to take responsibility away from the Committee on Banking and Currency because they feel that that committee has all it can do with the tremendous number of problems which come before it at the present time, and that we should establish again a special committee such as that which we had during the war and during the Eightieth Congress.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President. I merely want the Senate and the Nation to understand that the Senator from Illinois is not opposed to small business——

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

Mr. LUCAS. I have no time to yield. The Senator from Florida had approximately 2 hours, and I have only 2 or 3 minutes. I regret that I cannot yield.

What I want to say in my closing remarks, Mr. President, is that the Senator from Illinois has been charged by some persons with being opposed to small business. I quoted the figures in the beginning with respect to the amounts appropriated for the Small Business Committee only to show that the Senator from Illinois was in nowise opposed to small business. The truth of the matter is that I have never been affiliated with big business of any kind. I have been affiliated with small business in my home town of Havana, Ill., which is a town of approximately 4,500 persons, and I have always been interested in trying to do something for the independent businessman on the corner, whether he was the druggist, the groceryman, the hardware man, or the proprietor of some other small-business enterprise. I have seen a number of small businesses go by the wayside from time to time.

I was satisfied with the Small Business Committee which was operating during the war and which, after the war, rendered excellent service on behalf of small business. As the Senator from Montana said recently, it was only when the Small Business Committee decided that legislation was needed that it ever appeared, after an investigation, before a standing committee. It was possible that some standing committee might not have the necessary information. But any time that the Small Business Committee had information on which it thought legislation was necessary, it appeared before the proper committee and presented it, and a tremendous amount of legislation was enacted during the war and since the war as a result of the efforts of the Small Business Committee. There cannot be any question about that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that this controversy has been raging through the Senate and throughout the Nation as to what should be done, the Senator from Illinois desires to see the question settled once and for all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska yields 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the outset I want it understood that I am in favor of the strictest economy in Government in every sense of the word. I do not believe in the extension of any committee if the work can be performed in some other way, but in the case of small business I feel it is in an entirely different category from that of the ordinary line of business which comes before the Congress.

I realize that businessmen probably should not come to their Senators and Representatives for help, but Government has become so complicated that it is impossible for the ordinary businessman to have the means to transact business with his Government. There are in the Nation three and a half million business concerns, owned by an average of one and a half persons, which employ more than two-thirds of all the persons employed. Small business is a very substantial part of the American economy. At the present time the businessmen who own small businesses are very anxious to do business with the Government of the United States and with each other without being in direct opposition to the law. They cannot, as I stated, afford to have the attorneys and the accountants necessary to keep them within the bounds of law and regulations.

During my time in Congress when a small business committee was functioning it did a marvelous service. For example, in the matter of newsprint, it looked for a while as though it would be necessary for small weekly papers, such as church papers, veterans' organization papers, and labor organization papers, to go out of business because they did not have sufficient newprint. The distintinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] got together the large publishers of the United States, and they arranged for the allocation of sufficient newsprint to take care of those persons.

There was a time when it looked as if it would be impossible to secure tubular goods with which to drill wells in several States in the Central West so that it would be unnecessary to sell cattle because of lack of water, which would have caused a meat shortage. We were able to get together some manufacturers in Pittsburgh, and they produced the necessary pipe.

There was also a shortage of steel with which to construct veterans' hospitals. It was most difficult to get the amount needed, but it was found possible to secure an allocation by getting together the 11 largest steel producers in the country.

I might also mention the matter of exports. It was necessary to get permits for exports. That was a difficult thing to do. The Small Business Committee was able to help many small-business men obtain permits for exports.

There is another point which should be mentioned. The gray markets in steel, in newsprint, and in many other products cost many fine American businessmen an enormous amount of money.

This to some extent was corrected by publicity given by the Small Business Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Nebraska has 1 minute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation, so far as amendments are concerned, is that there is on the desk the revised amendment of the Senator from Nebraska which provides for setting up a permanent special committee without legislative authority. That is a recommendation which I think should be adopted. If we mean what we say, let us establish a special legislative committee. I have offered an amendment to Senate Resolution 58. Senators can vote for one or the other. I

understand that the Senator from Montana will offer another amendment perfecting my amendment, which would provide for establishing a committee at this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

The Senator from Nebraska has 1 minute left.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, so far as the amendments are concerned, the parliamentary situation, as I understand, is that there is on the desk a revised amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska which sets up a permanent special committee without legistive authority. That is the special committee which I think should be provided for. I believe that is what is needed. There is no use having this fight every session of Congress. If we mean what we say, let us establish a permanent special committee without legislative authority. I have offered an amendment to that effect to Senate Resolution 58, which is the resolution in which I joined with the distinguished Senator a year and a half ago, which provided for a permanent committee without legislative authority. That is the issue. Senators can vote for one or the other of the amendments.

I understood the Senator from Montana was to offer another amendment to my perfecting amendment which would provide for the establishment of a committee to function during this session of Congress and the next session. I do not see any difference between that and the one I have offered because both the committees would be permanent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired. All time for debate has expired.

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

Mr. TOBEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Illinois withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold it.

Mr. TOBEY. Do I correctly understand that in voting on the question about to come before the Senate all Senators who wish to set aside or nullify the spirit of the Senate as set forth in January 1937, in the Reorganization Act, will vote "yea"? Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of no quorum has been suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold it for a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand, those in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] will vote "yea," and those opposed will vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The parliamentary situation now is that the only pending question, in addition to the original resolution, is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska. Of course, that is the question that is to be voted on, and those who favor it will vote "yea," and those against it will vote "nay."

Mr. MAYBANK. The substitute is in the form of an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska offered by the Senator from Florida, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. The Senator from Nebraska offered a substitute by way of an amendment. The Senator from Montana yesterday proposed a substitute for that substitute, and then withdrew it. So now the only question pending is on the substitute of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the amendment in the nature of the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. I have withheld it for the last 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator still withhold it?

Mr. LUCAS. I still withhold it.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment, or substitute, or whatever it is.

Mr. WHERRY. How long can the withholding of a quorum call be maintained, inasmuch as there was an agreement to vote at 4 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can be withheld for any length of time, but if it is, some other Senator may make the suggestion, so that it could not go on indefinitely.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I suggest that it is like sand in the gear box.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted it is proposed to insert the following:

That (a) a special committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators shall be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution and to continue during the Eighty-first and the Eighty-second Congresses.

(b) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys.

(c) Senate Resolution 218, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 9, 1950, is hereby repealed, effective March 30, 1950.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a substitute for the substitute just stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by Mr. MURRAY, it is proposed to strike out all after the word *"Resolved"* and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That five Senators (three from the majority party and two from the minority party), to be appointed by the President of the Senate, shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to serve on said committee or subcommittee (a) when any study or investigation of the problems of small-business enterprises is being conducted pursuant to the authority granted to said committee by clause (2) of section 1 of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, and (b) when proposed legislation, the predominant subject matter of which relates to small-business enterprises, is under consideration. One such Senator shall be a member of the Committee on Finance, one shall be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one shall be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and each of the others shall be a member of such other standing committee of the Senate as may be designated by the President of the Senate.

SEC. 2. (a) The first section of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, is amended by striking out "during the Eighty-first Congress, until February 15, 1950,"; and by inserting after "small business, including" the following: "(but without limitation)."

(b) Section 2 of such resolution is amended by striking out "the Eighty-first Congress, until February 15, 1950," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Congress."

(c) Senate Resolution 218, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 9, 1950, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of Senate Resolution 101, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 6, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The authority granted by this resolution with respect to the problems of small-business enterprises shall not enlarge the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency as set forth in paragraph (d) of section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, nor shall it diminish the power of any other standing committee of the Senate to investigate any matter within its jurisdiction."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will explain the parliamentary situation. Under the precedents of the Senate the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska is regarded as the text of the resolution for purposes of amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Montana by way of a substitute is therefore in the first degree, that of the Senator from Florida is in the second degree, and no further amendment can be offered. The amendment or substitute offered by the Senator from Florida is not subject to amendment. Either the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska in the nature of a substitute or the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana in the nature of a substitute may be amended by way of amending the text, but the amendment of the Senator from Florida is not subject to further amendment, and that will have to be voted on first.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida in the nature of a substitute.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the

Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Hendrickson	McCarran
Benton	Hill	McClellan
Cain	Hoey	Maybank
Chapman	Holland	Robertson
Connally	Ives	Russell
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kerr	Stennis
George	Lehman	Taft
Hayden	Long	Tobey

NAYS—49

Anderson	Hunt	Mundt
Brewster	Jenner	Murray
Bricker	Kefauver	Myers
Butler	Kem	Neely
Capehart	Kilgore	O'Conor
Chavez	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Langer	Saltonstall
Darby	Leahy	Schoeppel
Donnell	Lodge	Taylor
Douglas	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McCarthy	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Watkins
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ferguson	McMahon	Wiley
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Martin	
Gurney	Morse	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Humphrey	Tydings
Byrd	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Withers
Graham	Pepper	Young
Hickenlooper	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. HOLLAND's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. LUCAS and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator for Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—31

Anderson	Hunt	McKellar
Benton	Johnson, Tex.	McMahon
Capehart	Kefauver	Magnuson
Chavez	Kerr	Murray
Connally	Kilgore	Myers
Douglas	Langer	Neely
George	Leahy	O'Conor
Gillette	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Green	Long	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Lucas	
Hill	McFarland	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Gurney	Mundt
Brewster	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bricker	Hoey	Russell
Butler	Holland	Saltonstall
Cain	Ives	Schoeppel
Chapman	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Donnell	Kem	Stennis
Downey	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	McCarran	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Tobey
Ferguson	McClellan	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Frear	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Humphrey	Tydings
Byrd	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Withers
Graham	Pepper	Young
Hickenlooper	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. MURRAY's substitute for Mr. WHERRY's substitute was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Nebraska is proposing the creation of a permanent standing committee, a select committee, or a permanent select committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not now in order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MORSE and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Illinois would like to have stated at this time the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is about to be voted upon, the Chair will ask that that be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word *"Resolved,"* and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution and at the commencement of each Congress.
>
> It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—56

Aiken	Hunt	Mundt
Anderson	Ives	Murray
Benton	Jenner	Myers
Brewster	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Butler	Kefauver	O'Conor
Capehart	Kem	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Darby	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Leahy	Taft
Downey	Lehman	Taylor
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Lucas	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Morse	

NAYS—26

Bricker	Hendrickson	McFarland
Cain	Hill	McKellar
Chapman	Hoey	Maybank
Connally	Holland	Robertson
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Flanders	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Frear	Long	Stennis
Fulbright	McCarran	Tobey
George	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Humphrey	Tydings
Byrd	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Withers
Graham	Pepper	Young
Hickenlooper	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 58 as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the text, as follows:

Resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business.

This resolution places upon the Chair the obligation of appointing the Select Committee. The Chair will announce his appointments later.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1990) to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of immigration hearings before a judiciary subcommittee; and

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations."

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois for unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution just read by its title?

Mr. WHERRY. I am forced to object to giving unanimous consent to the taking up of the measure at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. What would be the effect of agreeing to the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion, if agreed to, would set aside the unfinished business for today. But, inasmuch as an hour has been fixed for voting tomorrow, it would automatically come back before the Senate tomorrow.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. Would it come back at 12 o'clock, or would it not come back until the hour for voting?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would come back at 11 o'clock, at which hour the Senate is to meet tomorrow. The division of time would be maintained as heretofore ordered. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Magnuson
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Butler	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Myers
Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Leahy	Stennis
Ecton	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Taylor
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 398, which was stated by title a while ago.

Mr. McCARTHY and Mr. LUCAS rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois wish recognition?

Mr. LUCAS. Was the motion agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, it has not yet been voted on.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is open to debate.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

THE HYDROGEN BOMB

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the problem which is symbolized by the hydrogen bomb touches every facet of human existence—ideological, philosophical, cultural, moral and spiritual.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Senator will proceed.

Mr. LODGE. My statement will not take long. It is on a matter at least as important as the one we have been discussing.

Looking at it more narrowly from the standpoint of practical action by government, it impresses us first in its military aspect. We can understand how those who see nothing but its military impact become terrified, although even in this, the bleakest and most depressing phase of the whole business, there are elements of hope. For example, there appears to be no doubt of the following: that the United States can outproduce any other nation in the manufacture of these new weapons; that these new bombs will greatly increase the power of the defensive, which is surely an asset to a nation which has no aggressive intent; and that no aggressor can win a final decision by one—or a dozen—explosions of these new bombs in the opening days of a new war. Therefore, even in this military phase, which is the starkest and grimmest of all, we should be able to keep our nerve and our sense of proportion.

Mr. President, I hate to interfere with the conversations that are taking place on the floor, but I insist this is an important subject, and that it is one which it is proper to discuss on the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no such compunctions. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted. The Chair is always refreshing and capable.

But, happily, government is not confined to a strictly military contemplation of the problem symbolized by the hydrogen bomb. The United States Government, thanks to the unparalleled productivity of the American people, can make an economic approach to the world crisis and wherever in the world there has been enough local energy to take advantage of our help, our economic assistance has in the last few years yielded tremendous results. Within the prudent limits of our own resources we should react to the problem of the hydrogen bomb by extending economic aid.

Then there is the political approach, which has a huge potential. Although results achieved here insofar as the unification of Europe is concerned have been disappointing, conclusion of the North Atlantic Pact shows what can be done. Let us hope that the North Atlantic community will become increasingly real and that under the spur of these great new dangers there will develop a common political outlook among the free nations which should accomplish great new things.

Mr. President, I think we all can have the deepest and most sympathetic understanding of those who, on the Senate floor and off the Senate floor demand an immediate show-down with the Soviet Union in the form of an appeal for disarmament. We must applaud their purpose, although it appears certain that their method and such other methods as have lately been proposed seem at this moment calculated to defeat that purpose.

We cannot, for example, enter into a Big Two meeting with the Soviet Union and set up two worlds without gravely shaking the confidence of all our friends in the Western World whom we have done so much to help and who have made such encouraging progress. We cannot enter into bilateral conversations without looking as though we were turning our back on the whole system of collective security which is symbolized by the United Nations.

We should not be fair to ourselves or to our friends if we were to agree with the Soviets to a two-thirds or a one-half or a 100-percent reduction in armament expenditures. We, in the United States Army, for example, spend far more money for clothing, pay, food, housing, and medical care, for example, in our military forces because we are a country which treats people like human beings. If we and the Soviets agreed to eliminate all money expenditures, the Soviet could and would use men as slaves without pay. Nor would it be fair to ourselves or to our friends to agree to a limitation of those weapons of a technical and complicated nature where we have a natural advantage and where, therefore, any apparently international limitation is actually a gain for the Soviets.

We know very well that, even if the Soviets should surprisingly agree to some form of international inspection, they would insist on such a strained construction of their agreement that the inspections which we would be allowed to undertake, if any, would not really be inspections in any honest or complete sense of the term. We are practically sure, moreover, that any appeal of ours would at this juncture be rejected because the Soviets would regard it as a sign of weakness on our part.

I know that there are those who would then say: "Let them reject it. Let us here in America show that we at least are willing to disarm. We will thereby stand in a favorable light before world opinion and thus impress the public opinion of the free nations with our virtue and with our love of peace."

I cannot believe that this is wise counsel. To make an offer which we are sure will be rejected is, in the first place, to mislead our own people as to the chances for acceptance and to subject them to a correspondingly severe disappointment. It thus tends to hasten the day of a "showdown"—a day which I hope and believe will never come. To make an offer which we know will be rejected might well be seized upon by the Soviets as proof of the fact that we are looking for a pretext for war. They might well say, "Here are the Americans making us a proposition which they know we will reject. What earthly reason could they have for making such an offer other than that of trying to provide an excuse for hostilities?"

Seen in the light of these realities, the offer which so many of our well-intentioned citizens suggest will actually bring nearer the danger of war.

Does this mean that we are condemned to do nothing? Far from it. We must continue to build our strength in every way that we can. We must build it slowly whenever the slow way is the only way. We must build it fast in whatever ways it can be done quickly. We must do it quietly where that is the only way it can be done. And if there is a chance to build strength dramatically I hope we will also take advantage of that.

The truth is that our sincere fellow citizens who ask for an American appeal for disarmament are right in wanting disarmament, but wrong in the way they propose to get it. In the quest for peace disarmament is the second step—not the first. The first step is for us to get strong enough so that the Soviets will ask us for a disarmament conference. Then—and only then—will there be a real prospect of accomplishing results.

If you get discouraged by the apparent slowness of this procedure, remember that in 1945 we in effect fell off the top of a high cliff when at Yalta, Potsdam and through our own sudden demobilization we lost the advantage we built up during the war. We are now climbing back to the top of the cliff, but this is a slower business than falling down, and we must be patient.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My colleague has stated that he does not believe we should make any advance to Russia at this time, but he did not say anything about proceeding through the United Nations. Would he be willing to state, very briefly, his position on that question?

Mr. LODGE. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is, What is the Senator's attitude as to proceeding through the United Nations rather than through a bilateral conference.

Mr. LODGE. I think collective action is desirable, but I do not believe the United States should make the request or make the appeal, because, in my opinion, it would look like weakness on our part, and it would amount to nothing. If the proper conditions were created, the Soviets would have no difficulty in finding ways of letting us know that they wanted disarmament.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator believe many things must be done prior to a disarmament conference, such as the raising of the curtain so that there could be inspection, freedom of communication, and freedom of the press, in order that the facts could be determined prior to a disarmament conference? In other words, should we not begin with first things first, with reference to disarmament?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from Michigan has put his finger on a very essential point. Disarmament is not the first step. It is a step which can come only after some other things have been done.

COLORADO RIVER DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to

have placed in the body of the RECORD some tables relative to Senate bill 75, the central Arizona project. Many Senators have not been present during the course of the debate and are under the false impression that it is merely a controversy between California and Arizona. Of course that is not the case. Nevada, as well as California and Arizona, is interested in the matter.

It has been pointed out in the absence of some Senators that it is a project which calls for an authorization of a billion and a quarter dollars and that, in addition, it will remove the yardstick measurements which now exist under the reclamation laws.

Because so many of the Senators do not realize the immense amount of money involved in this project in the central Arizona area, I have had compiled for comparative purposes the total rivers, harbors, and flood-control authorizations in various groups of States in contrast to the billion-and-a-quarter dollar authorization provided for in Senate bill 75.

We find that for the New England States, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, for rivers, harbors, and flood control, the total authorizations amount to $348,400,000, or approximately one-fourth of the authorization in the project which will be voted on by the Senate tomorrow.

I have another break-down for the North Central States, showing that for the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin the total authorizations for rivers, harbors, and flood control, general, amount to $1,265,000,000, which is the approximate amount of the single authorization on which the Senate will be called upon to vote tomorrow.

I have another break-down for the Middle Atlantic States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, showing the total authorizations for rivers, harbors, and flood control, general, amount to $988,768,000, or considerably less than the authorization in this one bill which will be before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those break-downs appear as part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the break-downs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Authorizations and appropriations by States, rivers and harbors, and flood control, general

State	Total cost of authorized projects, including projects in approved comprehensive plans			Appropriations for construction		
	Rivers and harbors	Flood control, general	Total	Rivers and harbors	Flood control, general	Total
New England States:						
Connecticut	$16,380,700	$36,662,500	$53,043,200	$11,090,900	$11,063,000	$22,153,900
Maine	10,250,200		10,250,200	8,778,700		8,778,700
Massachusetts	67,791,500	64,032,400	131,823,900	60,347,400	19,745,000	80,092,400
New Hampshire	627,600	55,983,000	56,610,600	627,600	14,638,000	15,265,600
Rhode Island	9,772,300	5,831,000	15,603,300	9,697,900		9,697,900
Vermont	1,100,300	79,969,000	81,069,300	885,300	4,389,000	5,274,300
Total	105,922,600	242,477,900	348,400,500	91,427,800	49,835,000	141,262,800
North Central States:						
Illinois	266,269,800	195,911,600	462,181,400	147,041,800	57,247,000	204,288,800
Indiana	29,278,400	136,408,300	165,686,700	28,390,100	29,842,000	58,232,100
Michigan	176,995,400	2,290,600	179,286,000	113,305,700	1,655,000	114,960,700
Ohio	101,287,200	291,599,300	392,886,500	54,506,700	79,127,000	133,633,700
Wisconsin	48,147,500	17,779,000	65,926,500	43,705,400		43,705,400
Total	621,978,300	643,988,800	1,265,967,100	386,949,700	167,871,000	554,820,700
Middle Atlantic States:						
Delaware	38,234,000		38,234,000	33,409,700		33,409,700
Maryland	14,208,000	15,560,000	29,768,000	9,358,400	2,287,000	11,645,400
New Jersey	57,224,100	284,000	57,508,100	39,297,100	284,000	39,581,100
New York	192,231,900	136,241,000	328,472,900	142,833,900	65,887,000	208,720,900
Pennsylvania	113,381,600	421,404,300	534,785,900	77,021,000	111,135,000	188,156,000
Total	415,279,600	573,489,300	988,768,900	301,920,100	179,593,000	481,513,100

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 398 is on the Senate Calendar as a result of action by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In reporting the House measure the Senate committee has struck out all the House provisions after the enacting clause, and has instead inserted very largely the provisions of Senate bill 2919, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] on behalf of himself and several other Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, this joint resolution is an attempt to correct some inequities which it is claimed have arisen as a result of the application of Public Law 272. While the planting of cotton is going on, I believe it is impossible to examine carefully into all claims of inequities and to decide whether or not all of them are just, or whether any of them are just, or whether there should be any change in the law whatever. If at all possible, I believe the Senate should move to confer authority on the Secretary of Agriculture to make some adjustments in the Cotton Act. The whole danger is that the adjustments may be so large as to throw clear out of balance the possibility of the demand equaling the supply available. I believe that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in accepting the provisions of the Senate bill, has fairly well guarded against that possibility. The judgment of the House may prove to have been superior, but there is one section in the House bill which would add about 1,400,000 acres of cotton, according to the best estimates which the House committee was able to obtain.

At the time the provisions of the Senate bill were submitted to the Department of Agriculture, a request was presented to the Department for an estimate as to the acreage which would be added by the Senate bill. The committee was assured that the maximum acreage would probably be somewhere in the neighborhood of 790,000 acres. My own view is that we may find in actual operation there may be added only something in the neighborhood of 600,000 acres. In my opinion, the top figure will be 700,000 acres. I believe it is reasonable to assume that the many changes in ownership of cotton acreage, with 21,000,000 acres being allotted, may account for underplanting on many of the acres. Some people believe it will run as high as 2,000,000 acres. I do not believe it will run that high. I believe that with quotas becoming effective for the first time, the underplanting will be substantially less than 2,000,000 acres. I believe, however, that there is a strong probability and great likelihood that the 600,000 or 700,000 acres of cotton which would be added by the provisions of the Senate bill will not be more than the acreage which will be underplanted from the 21,000,000 acreage limitation. Therefore I believe that the over-all planting of cotton in 1950, if the provisions of the House joint resolution, as amended by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, were to be enacted, would stay within the 21,000,000-acre figure originally provided by the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate long with an explanation of the joint resolution. I should like to point out that there were opportunities for inequities. The hope behind the joint resolution was that in every State the amount of acreage which could be reserved by the State committee, and in turn, by the county committees, would be reserved and would be used for the handling of these inequities. I may say that where that has been done the complaints have been reduced to a minimum. In testimony before the Senate committee, one of the ablest persons dealing with this subject at the present time estimated that 90 percent of the cotton farmers were satisfied with the allotment.

The great majority of cotton farmers are small planters, and the small planters were adequately protected by the legislation passed in the form of Public Law 272. There were some complaints to the effect that some of the larger operators were cut too much. It was felt, for example, that if the reserve had been set aside in every instance and made available for the relief of some of the hardship cases, even their complaints would have been minimized. There was testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, given by a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oklahoma, to the effect that if those provisions had been adequately used in every case nearly all the

complaints would have been eliminated, and that there would have been general approval of the program.

The fact remains that, regardless of whether these things should have been done, in many instances they were not done. This was new legislation, handled by county committees, nearly all the members of which are volunteers, and the things they did were not perhaps the things they would do with more experience.

We test new legislation year by year. Cotton acreage is allotted by experience. We have been without cotton quotas for 8 years. Naturally, in many instances there are not now on the committees men who are familiar with the handling of this problem. So far as cotton provisions are concerned, I think the measure as reported to the Senate is reasonable. I think it will add a small amount of acreage, but I believe that the underplanting of acreage will be greater than the amount that would be added by the provisions of the joint resolution as reported by the Senate Committee.

Mr. President, there is an additional item in the bill to which I should like to refer briefly. It is a controversial subject. It deals with what the bill attempts to do with reference to potatoes. I recognize that there will be, as there has been and probably always will be, a very substantial difference of opinion as to how the potato situation can best be handled.

I have tried not to be harsh with the potato growers of the country. I realize that one of the important factors which contributed to the present great surplus of potatoes is that the growers were favored by extremely good growing weather in the last few months of the year. I invite attention to the fact that as late as August 1949, the predictions were for a crop somewhere in the magnitude of 365,000,000 bushels. Had we actually obtained a crop of 365,000,000 bushels, we would have been able to handle it without the slightest difficulty. The estimate which I have used comes from the Crop Reporting Board of the Department of Agriculture. It was based upon the best available information. It was based upon the size of the plantings and what might be regarded as a normal out-turn of the crop. Subsequently, and probably not until the month of December, it became known that the crop had gone far beyond the estimated out-turn, and that instead of 363,000,000 or 365,000,000 bushels of potatoes, we would have a crop somewhere in the neighborhood of 402,000,000 bushels, which happens to be the size of the 1949 crop.

Mr. President, I desire to refer now to the publication of the Department of Agriculture known as Changes in American Farming. This is Miscellaneous Publication No. 707. At page 44 there is a chart which I am sure Senators will find profit in studying. The chart shows that the average production of potatoes in the United States in 1920 was under 100 bushels per acre, and while the chart does not show it completely, it shows that somewhere about 1948 the production had reached almost 200 bushels per acre, more than double. But in 1949 the production was 220 bushels per acre. Therefore any Senator who looks at this chart will have to add to it the figures for the remarkable out-turn in 1949, and those figures will carry up to new heights.

About one-third of all the potatoes grown in the United States are produced in three States, Maine, California, and Idaho. It is interesting to look at the figures of production of potatoes in those States. In the State of California in 1920 there was an average production that was somewhere in the neighborhood of 135 bushels per acre. I cannot tell exactly from this chart, because the chart is only in units of 20, but the line starts below the 140 bushel figure, so I assume it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 135 bushels. That was the per-acre production in the State of California in 1920. In 1948 the average per-acre production was 385 bushels, and in 1949 it was in that level again.

The State of Idaho has been very much more constant. The production in the State of Idaho started at about 180 bushels, or somewhat less than that, perhaps 175 bushels to the acre, and by 1948 it was 245 or 250 or perhaps 255 bushels.

The State of Maine, however, starting at 220 bushels per acre, dropped to a figure of about 215 bushels in the year 1922. The production stayed fairly level with some fluctuation because of improved agriculture, but in the year 1949 it had increased from 215 bushels to the acre to 450 bushels to the acre.

Mr. President, when a thing like that happens, there is difficulty with a price-support program. Therefore, it has been the judgment of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that perhaps the best way to bring this matter to a head, and find a possibility of enacting legislation which would restrict the production completely, would be to wipe out price supports at this time entirely. Therefore, the distinguished Senator from Illinois proposed an amendment to the cotton-acreage bill which provided that no price support should be available to the producers of Irish potatoes when marketing quotas were not in effect. That is, of course, drastic and unusual treatment. It is different and discriminatory. I think that should be acknowledged in the beginning, because, if it is not acknowledged, someone will rise and say it is discriminatory treatment, since there is provision in the Agricultural Act of 1949 under which basic commodities receive price supports in the neighborhood of 90 percent, and they will continue to receive something in that neighborhood in the years to come. There is the provision also that certain nonbasic commodities shall receive supports ranging from 75 percent to 90 percent, and they are spelled out. Certain others shall receive price supports from 60 percent to 90 percent. Then there is the general provision which allows the Secretary to support all other commodities as he may deem it necessary and proper, at levels from 0 to 90 percent.

But now only in the case of potatoes there would be a provision that he could not do it at all. I say that only because I want Senators to recognize that this is a drastic treatment for a very difficult and perplexing situation. True it is that it might be possible to control the situation by some other device. But the opinion of the committee is that there should be time to consider appropriate legislation.

The Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, was ready with a bill to submit to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but there was obviously not time to stop and consider his bill. If hearings were to be afforded, it would require 10 days or 2 weeks to study the testimony and have consideration given by the committee to the provisions of the bill. In addition to that, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] last October introduced a bill respecting which many persons had been hopeful that there would be hearings long ago.

Now, it is possible for those two bills to come to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for full consideration. I trust that when they reach the committee there will be the element of time that will permit a careful study of the whole problem.

What shall we do in the meantime? If we allow the matter merely to lie dormant additional States will move into the area of those who have already planted their potatoes, and, with still further delay, the line will be moved very much more rapidly into the northern areas; into the intermediate areas, and finally into the areas of late potatoes. If that sort of delaying procedure should occur there would be no action at all which would be effective at the present session of Congress.

This matter is of importance to all segments of agriculture, because if there are years and years of bad experience with a crop such as potatoes, the support extended to all other agricultural commodities may be jeopardized, and particularly to those basics which have been supported by a decision of the American Congress and the administration for a great many years. I think the chances of damage to the potato growers are very much less than the possibilities of damage to all the rest of the agricultural economy, which is of over-all importance. I therefore feel that we would be doing a favor to all American agriculture in adopting this very simple amendment which strikes all potato support. I think the result of such action will be a strong and vigorous demand for immediate and prompt consideration of legislation which will make possible quotas upon potatoes. It is not yet impossible for legislation of that kind to become effective on this year's crop.

Therefore, it seems to me that the part of wisdom for the Senate would be to accept this rider which is, as I have frankly admitted, discriminatory, and permit the matter then to go to conference. I hope the House will agree to the amendment, and that the adoption of the rider will bring to the attention of the Congress the immediate need for doing something with potato-acreage quota legislation.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that the price support on potatoes which are now planted in the southern section of the country actually has very little effect upon the price itself because they are new potatoes, the first ones to come on the market? Is it not a fact that those potatoes as a general rule sell above the price support?

Mr. ANDERSON. The price support on potatoes in 1950 will be $1.01 a bushel. The report of last year's crop showed that the early potatoes sold at $2.85 a bushel. Those figures have been placed in the RECORD. Potatoes from Louisiana, as I am sure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will testify, generally bring well above the support level.

Mr. LUCAS. If that holds true, then the support price, so far as those potatoes are concerned, would have nothing to do with their actual market price, and the Government would be losing nothing upon those potatoes so far as the support price is concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is approximately true, but not completely true. The Government will lose something, because it is already buying a few potatoes, and will continue to do so, but the amount of potatoes it buys is not tremendous.

As I tried to point out the other day, it is the abundance of these crops which is the best regulator of their prices. The fact that we support a few when there is a tremendous outpouring of potatoes really means that what we are doing is guaranteeing to the American public a very satisfactory market in which they will buy their potatoes. For example, in 1946, as I remember, something like 100,000,000 more bushels of potatoes were produced than in 1947. The average price to the farmers was something like $1.24 in 1946, and $1.43 the next year, when the potato crop was smaller. So that while the Government spent quite a bit of money for supports that year, the consuming public, the country as a whole, profited, because the price of potatoes dropped when there was a larger crop.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It is estimated, as I understand, that in the crop year 1950 we will lose nearly $100,000,000 on potatoes alone.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator that he probably refers to the crop year of 1949.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I am referring to the crop year 1949. It is estimated that we will lose nearly $100,000,000 on that crop. Now, what we are trying to do by this amendment is to prevent the same situation from occurring with respect to the 1950 crop. If I understand the situation correctly, we will lose around $100,000,000 on potatoes this year. However, it is my understanding that if this amendment is adopted we can save at least $50,000,000 on the 1950 crop, provided we follow it up, as I hope we shall do, with the bill which I introduced the other day, which applies rigid restrictions through marketing quotas, agreements, and other necessary controls to the potato growers on the same basis that similar controls now apply to the cotton farmer and the tobacco farmer. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator from Illinois is correct in saying that if the rider is adopted, and we then pass effective quota legislation, the saving might be as much as $50,000,000. I think it is fair to say that there are many potato growers throughout the country who would question very greatly some of the provisions in the Senator's bill, and I am sure the Senator wants them to have the fullest opportunity to be present at hearings. We are not foreclosing what the decision on that question will be. But if as the result of the hearings and the suggestions made by potato growers it is possible to pass effective quota legislation, then I think that the rider, plus the legislation referred to, will save $50,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. That is exactly the reason for the offering of the amendment. It seems to me we have to do something drastic, something that is out of the ordinary, in order to bring the potato situation forcibly home to the American people. The Senator from Illinois does not want in any way to harm the potato growers of the Nation. The fact that we have given to the potato growers one-half billion dollars out of the Treasury in the past 7 years is a pretty good indication that we have not attempted to harm the potato growth. But the time has come when we must cease pouring this unusual amount of money out of the Treasury into a particular crop over which we have no effective control. All I want to do is to follow up this amendment with the bill I introduced the other day, along with the one introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, so that hearings can be held and there can be established effective controls over potato production. This can be done, according to the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. It is understood that the potato support program will cost the taxpayers from $80,000,000 to possibly $100,000,000 this year. But does not the Senator from New Mexico understand that if the Secretary had chosen to use the provisions of the law in requiring compliance with marketing practices through the marketing agreements, and which we are given to understand he does intend to use this year, the cost of the potato support program would have been reduced somewhere between two-thirds and three-quarters of the amount which it is now costing?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is fair to say that I do not know what the Secretary of Agriculture did in the way of using the provisions which were in the Marketing Act of 1948.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator understands, does he not, that the Secretary did not use that provision of the law which would have given him the right to require compliance with the marketing practices as a qualification for price support?

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that he did not, but I have no way of knowing, and it was my hope that when we got into the consideration of the long-range provisions of the bill we would have before us the desirability of having marketing agreements, and that at that time it would be possible to question the Department of Agriculture to find out exactly what had been done. I understand the marketing orders were not issued. I tried to explain that as late as August, and probably later, it was anticipated that the crop would not be in excess of about 360,000,000 to 365,000,000 bushels, and if the crop had stood to that magnitude it would not have been necessary to have marketing orders or agreements. When the fact became apparent that the Maine crop was going to be very much larger and that other crops in other States was going to be very much larger, I do not happen to know.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that as late as November the total size of the potato crop was underestimated by about 40,000,000 bushels?

Mr. ANDERSON. My understanding is that very late it was underestimated by a great many million bushels.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator understand that the provision whereby the Secretary could require compliance with marketing practices was inserted in the law at the request of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. It was my understanding that it was inserted in the law at the request of the Department of Agriculture; yes.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows more about the so-called Anderson bill than any other individual, because he was instrumental in securing its enactment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the distinguished majority leader that the question propounded by the Senator from Vermont has to do with the Agricultural Act of 1948, in which marketing agreements were first inserted at the request of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. ANDERSON. They were carried forward in the Agricultural Act of 1949, however.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. But, referring to the bill at present on the statute books as an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, known as the Anderson bill, I ask the Senator, Is that bill, plus whatever other laws are on the statute books at the present time, sufficient to control potatoes, if we are going to support them under the so-called price-support program?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I would wish to know what the Department of Agriculture planned to do under that program. I may say to the Senator that if the program did not have the type of

marketing orders added to it as was the case in 1948, it would not be sufficient to control potatoes. I believe marketing agreements can be effective if they are backed up by marketing orders.

Mr. LUCAS. One further question. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture when the potato program was established, and that he recommended to the Congress from time to time that it do something about that matter, and that the 1938 act was in effect when the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture. My point is this: In view of the question of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], does the Senator believe the Secretary of Agriculture has power, or ever had power, to control potato production?

Mr. ANDERSON. He had his first possibility of power in connection with the 1949 crop, under the Agricultural Act of 1948.

I am not convinced that marketing agreements alone are sufficient to control potatoes. The reason why I say that is my belief that a marketing agreement, in order to be effective, must be supported by a desire on the part of both parties to support the agreement, and I do not think there is a desire at the present time to enforce marketing agreements on the crop.

That is a wholly different situation from what we find in connection with the citrus-fruit crop, where the citrus-fruit growers want the marketing agreement to work. When the growers want the marketing agreement to work, it works effectively, as I am certain the distinguished Senator from Florida will testify.

Mr. LUCAS. The whole question, then, comes down to the difference between marketing agreements and marketing quotas. Certainly it seems to me, in view of the money which has been lost on the support program on the potato crop in the last 5 or 6 years that if marketing agreements were effective to control production, they would have been put into use long before now.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Illinois that the only way we shall control potato production is by means of the rigid controls set up in the bill introduced last year by the Senator from Oklahoma, and more or less duplicated in a bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator understand that the Secretary of Agriculture is requiring marketing agreements to be in effect for the 1950 crop, as a qualification for price supports under the same provision of law, which was in the law last year

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I understand that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And does not the Senator also understand that if the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to use that provision of law this year, he certainly must have had the same authority to use the same provision of law last year? I do not say that the failure to use it was not due to a gross underestimate of the potato crop, due to the remarkably good growing season; but does not the Senator from New Mexico also understand that it cost the taxpayers, this year, in the neighborhood of $100,000,000 to support the potato crop, which is supposed to be under airtight Government control? I know it is difficult to get the exact amount, but it is in the neighborhood of $100,000,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I do not think it is in the neighborhood of $100,000,000. I think it is in the neighborhood of $35,000,000.

I do not believe it is possible to put peanuts under airtight controls as yet. Perhaps I should say that in the operation of the law, the limitation has been put at 2,100,000 acres. That amount of land will produce more peanuts than the country will use this year, and there will be a loss on this year's crop.

But in 1951 it will be possible to put peanuts under complete acreage controls, and I hope the peanut growers will remember that that probably will mean less than one and one-half million acres, and possibly less than 1,000,000 acres.

Mr. AIKEN. In estimating the cost of the peanut-support program this year at $35,000,000—and I think the late estimate of the Department is thirty-eight million some hundred thousand dollars—the Senator from New Mexico is omitting the peanuts which were taken off the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation by the Army and the ECA; is he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not entirely. There are two amounts of peanuts that are handled there.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not mean to get into this subject; but in part peanuts are handled under a foreign export program, under which the ECA and the Army were charged 8⅛ cents, as against the total, over-all cost of 16¼ cents. Certain other quantities were sold to the ECA and to the Army at cost, which means 16¼ cents. I think on those the Army takes a loss, because the oil costs it more than the 8¼ cents for which it can buy the oil in the market.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is getting away from the question in talking about peanuts now, because we are concerned here with potatoes. The Senator knows that last year I did as much as any other Senator in trying to control the potato situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I only wish the Senator had been successful.

Mr. LUCAS. I attempted to be.

Nevertheless, we are now talking about potatoes. The Senator from Vermont appears to be telling the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture has the power, under the marketing agreements, to control potatoes. But the evidence will show, when we finally get to the point of taking evidence—at least, I have been so advised—that the measure we are now debating, followed up with quotas will save the taxpayers $50,000,000 on the 1950 crop.

The Senator from Vermont would create the impression that the Departmental officials have not done the correct thing. Regardless of whether they have or whether they have not, those officials now tell us that if this proposed legislation is enacted, we can save $50,000,000 on potatoes alone this year and in view of what the potato growers have received during the past 5 or 6 years, this legislation would not harm any producer very much.

I am interested in the potato question, not because I am attempting to be unduly harsh with the United States potato farmers—certainly I am not—but because I am interested in the great farm program which we in the Congress have enunciated over a period of years, and which has been the most successful program of its type in all the history of America.

Certainly we must have a prosperous agricultural economy in order to have a prosperous America. If we continue to subsidize crops, over which we have no control whatever—whether it be peanuts or potatoes or any other crop—we shall finally break down the program. I am interested in the continuing stability of our whole farm program, more than anything else.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished majority leader that if I were in the position of Secretary of Agriculture and had to have an effective program for the control of the potato situation, so that it would not cost the Government more than it should cost—and some little cost is justified—I would want marketing quotas. I think that is the best and the most effective way, certainly, to handle this situation.

I am not able to say whether marketing agreements would be effective in the case of potatoes. Before a judgment is passed upon that question, I would want to see what was done in 1949, under the terms of the Agricultural Act of 1948, and what has thus far been done in 1950, under the terms of the Agricultural Act of 1949. I would want to see what marketing orders were issued, what attempts were made to establish grades. Then I might be able to say whether I thought it was an effective way to handle the potato program.

I may say that when the original legislation was enacted, it was the opinion of the Department of Agriculture that marketing agreements would be, to a great degree, effective. At that time it looked as if the potato growers wanted to cooperate and would cooperate. I still think a great majority of the potato growers will cooperate in a marketing-agreement program. If it is possible to handle this situation by means of marketing agreements, certainly that is a very desirable and satisfactory way to handle it.

Unfortunately, we have not yet had sufficient experience, in my opinion, to be able to know whether it will be effective; and what experience I have had

leads me to believe that I would like to have marketing quotas on a crop, rather than marketing agreements.

Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BREWSTER, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi, who has been seeking recognition for some time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether I correctly understood him to say, a while ago, that the proposed cotton bill will add 600,000 acres to the present allotments for cotton.

Mr. ANDERSON. I said the official estimate of the Department of Agriculture was 790,000 acres; and I have no way of disputing that figure, except that other estimates, made inside the Department, run as low as 600,000 acres, and some run as high as 800,000 acres. I believe the correct figure to be between the two.

Mr. STENNIS. But regardless of that, the Senator from New Mexico believes the total acreage will not exceed that presently allowed by law, namely, 21,000,000 acres; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so. I think there will be underplanting, not nearly so much as some persons believe, but sufficient so that the acreage will still come within the 21,000,000 acres, or perhaps slightly above it.

Mr. STENNIS. I understood the Senator to say that the present law has operated exceedingly well for the small grower and operator.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. And that the present measure will take care of some of the inequities affecting the larger operators.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not necessarily that.

Mr. STENNIS. But is it not true that the bill affects smaller operators also, because many of them are tenants and have to come under the allotments allowed the larger land owners.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct; and I hope I did not leave the impression that only the large operators' allotments will be affected by this measure. There is a situation in the State of Texas, for example, which will be handled by it, that has nothing to do with either large or small operations, where all the crops will be taken care of. It is an attempt to make possible the application by the Department of certain additional facts or circumstances which they were not able to apply at an earlier date.

Mr. STENNIS. But, even in the case of large operators who are going to be taken care of, this measure affects many people, because they are tenants who receive their acreage really under the larger operator's allotment. Is that not true?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I may say every large operator, unless it be those in the large irrigated sections, operates with a system of tenants, who derive their allocation from the larger operator, and it happens that most of the relief will come in the States where that is the practice. Under the proposal there will be no relief, or only minor relief, to the State of California, for example, where there is a large irrigated area. The advantage will come, as the Senator from Mississippi has indicated, to the States where the large operator uses the tenant in his operation.

Mr. STENNIS. The family-unit farmer is the one who will benefit.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In view of the apparent fact that the Secretary did not deem it wise to use the power he possessed last year, and in view of the fact that the potato growers of the country were the ones who took the 60-percent parity, and the only ones so far as the major crops are concerned, would it not be more considerate and more equitable that the potato industry should have the opportunity to have its case considered before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and to recommend whatever additional legislation may seem to be indicated, to deal with the problem, before they are entirely deprived of the support program? That would be the effect of the rider in this case.

Mr. ANDERSON. In answer to the distinguished Senator, I said quite frankly, as I began, that this was discriminatory legislation, and I so recognize it, but I see no way of getting effective and early action without discriminatory legislation. I think it is a chopping-off, which I concede to be unfair, but it will probably precipitate immediate consideration of an acreage bill which will establish workable quotas.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is not that unfair, If I may use the word? No hearings have been held. The potato industry has been ready to go ahead with hearings on this matter, and would welcome an opportunity, if the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and his colleagues, could set this question for an immediate hearing. It would give some assurance of consideration which has already been too long delayed.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Maine places me in a bad position. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee which called upon the Department of Agriculture for a legislative proposal. The legislative proposal came, was received by the chairman of the committee, and was introduced by him as a bill. I think it would have been well if we had had hearings on it last October or, preferably last September, and had completed the hearings, so they might have been incorporated in legislation early in January. But a great many things intervened to make that impossible. I could also state to the distinguished Senator that I had not intended to say anything about that in speaking on the joint resolution, but in the absence of the chairman, members of the committee asked me to explain the cotton provisions of it, and naturally I felt obligated also to explain why we went into the potato situation as we did. I have tried to be fair and to say I do not think this is fair treatment, but I say it is a type of drastic treatment that sometimes makes it possible to obtain fair treatment. If I may take just another minute, let me say further to the distinguished Senator from Maine that when the matter comes before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I hope my conduct then will convince him that I should still like to be fair to the potato growers of the country. I think this is a necessary step perhaps to bring the question before the Congress in an effective way. Somehow, nothing would have been done with it, otherwise. The Senator has said the potato growers have been ready to proceed for 5 months. I think he is entirely correct in that statement, and therefore I think perhaps we have done them an injustice, and this may be another injustice. Two wrongs may not make one right, at all, but it may be that out of these two wrongs we may finally get some legislation that may be fair.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wanted to ask one more question. Section 2 of the joint resolution as amended reads:

> No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Assuming that the joint resolution becomes effective on March 1, and the potato quota bill is enacted into law, effective April 15, what will be the status of potatoes planted between March 1 and April 15? Also what will be the status regarding quotas of potatoes already planted, and which will be above ground by March 1?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I could answer those questions for the Senator from Vermont. I imagine when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is considering the matter they will attempt to draft some sort of schedule which will make it possible to dispose of that question. I was going to say it would seem to me it would be desirable to have the provision reach as far back as possible. I am not greatly worried about what happens to potatoes planted in January, February, and March. I think that generally speaking they can be handled without much loss to the Federal Government, and whatever loss there might be would be more than offset by the lower prices paid by the consumers as they buy those potatoes in the stores. If, Mr. President, we had a great scarcity in January, February, and March of the early potatoes, then the price might be very high in the stores, and I would rather have a little bit larger supply, and support them a little bit, than to have a scarcity of those early potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question. Suppose a North Carolina farmer plants, we may say, 50 acres before the acreage law goes into effect, and then finds he is entitled to market only the product from 35 of the acres he has planted. Would we then expect the other 15 acres to be destroyed? What would happen to them?

Mr. ANDERSON. I still say that is a matter the committee would have to consider. I do not think it presents too great a problem, because I think quotas can be allowed to a great many in the early,

intermediate steps, and still not bring about too great distress.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The able senior Senator from Vermont raised the question I had in mind, as to what would be done with the producer who either had his potatoes planted or was in process of harvesting them. But I could not quite follow the able Senator from New Mexico when he said that an excess yield, or an excess amount of early potatoes might be advantageous rather than a handicap. I think they have been a handicap to the Department of Agriculture, only in the most recent weeks, because, while I may not have the positive facts, I read in the public press that they have been buying some early potatoes at the present time in order to support the program, or to support the potato price, while in the northern section of the United States, the late potatoes are in surplus and we are attempting to dispose of them. So I cannot see how, if the Government is purchasing early potatoes in the deep South to support the program, those potatoes are not a problem to the Nation and to the Department of Agriculture at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that, earlier, I had admitted that, as I understood, some potatoes had been purchased in the South at this time. I say only that the surplus potatoes are the best price-regulating mechanism we have, and that applies to all farm programs.

I hope that in imposing quite drastic legislation affecting potatoes, we do not so fix the quotas that we will have a scarcity of potatoes. I should rather have a little abundance of potatoes, and remove them from the markets, than to have a scarcity of potatoes. Therefore, that is why I said I did not think the amount which had thus far been developed to be at all dangerous or to be costing the Government too much money.

Mr. THYE. If the able Senator from New Mexico will yield further, I fully agree with his statement as to a surplus, and that possibly it is to the benefit rather than a handicap to consumers of the Nation. If they do not plant sufficient acres to get a yield that affords a sufficient supply to meet the demand, the scarcity of the product may cause consumers to pay an enormous price. If and when we get to a point where we attempt to regulate every unit of production to merely our domestic consumption, we may find a short season when production is not so favorable as the production of potatoes was in the past going season of 1949. If that happens, Mr. President, then, consumers are going to pay a great deal more than the cost they paid under support prices at 60 percent of parity, as we had it in the calendar year 1949 and this winter of 1950.

I believe that in dealing with this overall question, we have got to make it clear on the Senate floor what we are going to do with the potatoes which are today planted and are growing, and to make it clear whether the support will be available to those who are planting this spring, in the late potato-producing areas, because it is absolutely wrong for the Congress to permit one section of the United States, in producing a crop, to receive a different support from that which is accorded to farmers in another section producing the same type of crop. So I definitely hope that when the question is finally disposed of we will have written into the law provisions which will be applied to the growers across the Nation, not merely to the growers in certain sectors of the country.

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have badly infringed upon the time of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask one more question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like first to make one brief observation to the Senator from Minnesota. The joint resolution clearly says that potatoes which are planted up to the time of the effective date of the rider shall receive price support. This would not be the first time that there has been a difference in the way a price support has been given to potatoes, because at one time the price support was only made available to what were called storable potatoes, and the early and intermediate potatoes did not receive price support. I therefore suggest we have not always handled the problem exactly alike, although I admit to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that it probably is discriminating and may be unfair. I have tried to be frank about that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one more question, please. Is it not true, I would ask the Senator from New Mexico, that a very substantial portion, possibly from 30 to 50 percent, of the contemplated surplus this year, may be the result of the influx of Canadian potatoes into our country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not be able to say how much it may be, because I am not familiar with the figures. I have already conceded that the influx of Canadian potatoes, when we had a 50,000,000-bushel surplus, was a very distressing item.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that the President has the entire power to stop that influx whenever he shall deem it expedient in the public interest?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. I do not think so, because I understand there is a provision in the tariff law which allows a certain amount to come in at a reduced rate, and which provides higher rates beyond that for additional quantities. The Senator from Maine is far more able to answer his own question than I am, and I shall therefore leave it with him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to send to the desk and ask to have printed and lie on the table an amendment which I propose to offer to House Joint Resolution 398, when it comes before the Senate for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Vermont in offering that amendment. If my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] were present, he would also like to be associated in offering the amendment. He is at present at home because of the illness of his mother.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that I welcome his association with me in that amendment, and I should welcome any other Senators from agricultural States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the senior Senator from North Dakota will be added as a sponsor of the amendment.

MILITARY SERVICE OF BRIG. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement prepared by myself dealing with the military service of Brig. Gen. Julius Klein and an additional statement of his military service.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER

Mr. President, I am happy to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen soldier with whose past record I am fully acquainted. Julius Klein has devoted a rich and active life to the service of his country and to his fellow men.

Julius Klein entered active military service with the Thirty-third Division in March 1941, before this country was at war. He did special research work on north African and German problems and prepared a comprehensive paper on combat public relations, which dealt with the problems of psychological warfare, military government, and propaganda. However, he was eager to assume active duties and requested that he be assigned to a service which would enable him to participate in active combat.

Holding the rank of lieutenant colonel, he was later placed in command of the Second Battalion, Twenty-third QM Truck Regiment, with which unit he was assigned to New Caledonia. He saw action in the South Pacific and later in the Philippines. He and his battalion received numerous commendations and was rated "superior" by the Inspector General. He was cited for bravery in the South Pacific by Lieutenant General Harmon, and was later awarded the Soldier's Medal for heroism by the President.

General Klein was later placed in command of the Five Hundred and Twenty-third QM Group, and assumed the responsibility of expediting the movement of cargo and troops from the port of Noumea. So well did he carry out his duties, under the stress of war and in the face of a multitude of wartime problems, that the convoy operations in that area were enormously improved.

General Klein later commanded his group during the invasion of the Philippines and took full charge of all service troops on the island of Cebu. His group executed the movement of the Twenty-fifth Division to the Philippine theater, which was subsequently commended by the division commander and others as having been the best planned and executed movement of its size yet witnessed.

General Klein has made equally important contributions to the Illinois National Guard. Before a group of American Legionnaires at Bloomington, Ill., General Klein delivered what may well be called a speech of historic importance to the National Guard

system. In this speech, he opposed the federalization of the National Guard, a subject in which many of us in the Senate are deeply concerned. Very sagaciously, he invited attention to the danger of federalization. He said, and I quote: "The National Guard system, comprising, as it does, citizen soldiers, has always been a bulwark against the concentration of military power in our Federal Government. I urge all citizens in groups and as individuals to take appropriate action to assure the rejection by Congress of proposals which would destroy our existing National Guard system." Unquote.

At the end of World War II, General Klein was called to Washington to assume the post of special assistant to the then Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson.

Mr. President, I would like to close with a quotation from the great American Douglas MacArthur's message to General Klein. "My appreciation for the conspicuous service you rendered while a member of my command is a matter of official record, as is your service prior to that time. Your promotion to the grade of brigadier general is not only a highly deserved honor, but in furtherance of the public interest as well." This personal tribute from one of the world's greatest soldiers is solid indication of General Klein's standing in the brotherhood of patriotic military men who have contributed to America's glory.

I am sure that many of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate join me in spirit in paying tribute to this worthy gentleman, Julius Klein.

MILITARY RECORD, BRIG. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN—EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS AND OFFICIAL REPORTS

"He has always demonstrated his suitability for the rank of brigadier general."—Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., May 6, 1946.

"He was assigned as port commander (Noumea) and reorganized the same in a superior manner. * * * He has definitely demonstrated his suitability for the rank of brigadier general."—Maj. Gen. Rush B. Lincoln, May 7, 1946.

"Your unselfish and outstanding devotion to duty merit this long overdue recognition of the conspicuous service you have given this Nation."—Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, February 16, 1948.

"It has come to my attention that Col. Julius Klein has been selected as Commanding General of an AAA Brigade in the Illinois National Guard. I was most pleased to receive this news as I feel that it is a recognition of Colonel Klein's ability and a mark of approval of his performance in World War II. He will no doubt do an equally fine job in the citizen soldier army. * * * It is gratifying to see his ability recognized. Colonel Klein is a man of great ability and one who has imagination coupled with an amazing capacity for work. His selection therefore seems to me to be very wise."—Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., February 20, 1948.

"Colonel Klein has proved himself to be a fine and outstanding soldier and fully worthy of the faith you have placed in him by your recent recommendation that he be promoted to general officer rank. The National Guard will certainly benefit greatly by your action."—Maj. Gen. Ewart G. Plank, February 24, 1948.

"I have followed with interest his assignments, and the manner in which he has performed them all bear witness to his outstanding ability and his worthiness for the awards presented. * * * I regret that I am not in a position, due to my retirement, to place an official endorsement on General Klein's promotion papers. However, I would like to add my recommendation for Federal recognition of his promotion and to inform you of my complete confidence in his ability to serve in the rank of brigadier general."—Maj. Gen. Rush B. Lincoln, March 5, 1948.

"He has the proper training and seasoned judgment for such a responsibility and I would not hesitate to have Colonel Klein in his new position under my command if the occasion should arise. I heartily endorse your recommendation and the promotion of Col. Julius Klein to brigadier general."—Lt. Gen. Robert Eichelberger, March 18, 1948.

"I am delighted to hear of your recent promotion to the grade of brigadier general in the Illinois National Guard. It is a well-deserved and long overdue honor, and you have my congratulations."—Gen. Douglas MacArthur, April 9, 1948.

"My appreciation for the conspicuous service you rendered while a member of my command in 1945–46 is a matter of official record. * * * I consider that your promotion to the grade of brigadier general is not only a highly deserved honor but in furtherance of the public interest as well and had the war not terminated when it did, I have no doubt but that you would have received this promotion in the due course of your active duty in the Army of the United States."—Gen. Douglas MacArthur, April 17, 1948.

"Brigadier General Klein served in my office when I was Secretary of War. * * * I cannot say too much for the caliber of his work. He is an officer of marked ability and notable vigor. I am sure that he is thoroughly qualified for Federal recognition in his present rank and post."—Judge Robert P. Patterson, April 15, 1948.

"As I relinquish my office as Governor of Illinois, I should like to express my appreciation for the splendid efforts you have expended in the service of our State and Nation. * * * The tremendous efforts, the immeasurable value of this work, cannot be overrated. You have my heartfelt thanks for this job which has meant so much to the Nation we both serve. I was therefore pleased to receive and act favorably upon General Haffner's recommendation for your promotion to brigadier general."—Governor Dwight H. Green, January 8, 1949.

"I desire to take this opportunity to express to you my personal gratification of your interest in our national security as exemplified by your participation as a student in Senior Officers' Indoctrination Course, held at the Antiaircraft and Guided Missiles Branch of the Artillery School, Fort Bliss, Tex. * * * The interest and enthusiasm which you have displayed throughout the course has been an inspiration to both the faculty and the other student members of the class."—Maj. Gen. John L. Homer, February 17, 1949.

"I was particularly impressed by his knowledge of military tactics and strategy and his keen appreciation of the use of antiaircraft artillery and guided missiles. It is my opinion that his professional qualifications are sufficient to qualify him for the rank of brigadier general, National Guard, to command an antiaircraft brigade. I would be highly pleased to have him as a general officer in command of units in any command I might have."—Maj. Gen. John L. Homer, July 11, 1949.

"Brigadier General Klein is, in my opinion, a real leader, and manifests this military leadership successfully and effectively in the distinctly high quality of his troop commands. I am satisfied that his knowledge, training, sound judgment, courage, and fine personal qualities fully qualify him for his appointment as brigadier general."—Maj. Gen. Ewart G. Plank, July 16, 1949.

"I consider it not only a privilege, but my duty, as the former chief executive and wartime Governor of Illinois, to appear before this Board in behalf of Julius Klein, a worthy citizen-soldier who has rendered distinguished services to the State and Nation, and who, particularly during my 8 years as Governor of Illinois, was of immeasurable value to me in matters pertaining to the military establishment of our State. * * * General Klein is eminently well qualified to hold positions in the military, because he has energy, ambition, drive, keen intelligence, loyalty, superior judgment, and forthrightness."—Dwight H. Green, July 25, 1949.

"I am familiar with the services rendered by Brigadier General Klein in World War II and with his subsequent performance of duty. For some time he served as special assistant to me in the office of the Secretary of War. * * * He discharged his duties with fidelity, skill, and ability, being indefatigable in his work. He has unusual qualities of leadership. It is my opinion that he is thoroughly qualified for Federal recognition."—Judge Robert P. Patterson, September 8, 1949.

"The results obtained during the field training of the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade are ample proof of the capabilities of the brigade commander and staff. * * * The brigade commander is to be commended for his initiative, energy, and enthusiasm which has been so largely responsible for the success of the camp. Through the brigade commander's varied experiences he has acquired an intimate knowledge of human nature, and as a result has been able to instill in his entire command a very high morale and a desire to reflect credit upon the citizen-soldier of our country."—Field Training Inspection Report, Fifth Army Inspection Team, August 7, 1948.

"This unit has progressed rapidly and shows evidence of excellent leadership."—Annual Armory Inspection Report, Inspector General Fifth Army, January 3, 1949.

"This is the second field training phase in which this unit has taken part. * * * The excellent results shown by the units under their command are due to a considerable degree to the organizational ability and systematic supervision of the brigade commander and his staff. An examination of the brigade commander's record and his conduct in the field indicate that he is well qualified both as an executive and a troop commander."—Field Training Inspection Report, Fifth Army Inspection Team, August 24, 1949.

"Based on technical proficiency, condition of equipment, camp and range discipline, courtesy and morale, the training standard existing in the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade, Illinois National Guard, as compared with other National Guard units, is superior."—Report of Staff Visit by Representative of Chief Army Field Forces, September 7, 1949.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a subject tonight which concerns me more than does any other subject I have ever discussed before this body, and perhaps more than any other subject I shall ever have the good fortune to discuss in the future. It not only concerns me, but it disturbs and frightens me.

About 10 days ago, at Wheeling, W. Va., in making a Lincoln Day speech, I made the statement that there are presently in the State Department a very sizable group of active Communists. I made the further statement, Mr. President, that of one small group which had been screened by the President's own security agency, the State Department refused to discharge approximately 200 of those individuals.

The Secretary of State promptly denied my statement and said there was not a single Communist in the State De-

partment. I thereafter sent a telegram to the President, which I should like to read at this time:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

In the Lincoln Day speech at Wheeling Thursday night I stated that the State Department harbors a nest of Communists and Communist sympathizers who are helping to shape our foreign policy. I further stated that I have in my possession the names of 57 Communists who are in the State Department at present. A State Department spokesman promptly denied this, claiming that there is not a single Communist in the Department. You can convince yourself of the falsity of the State Department claim very easily. You will recall that you personally appointed a board to screen State Department employees for the purpose of weeding out fellow travelers—men whom the board considered dangerous to the security of this Nation. Your board did a painstaking job, and named hundreds which had been listed as dangerous to the security of the Nation, because of communistic connections.

While the records are not available to me, I know absolutely of one group of approximately 300 certified to the Secretary for discharge because of communism. He actually only discharged approximately 80. I understand that this was done after lengthy consultation with the now-convicted traitor, Alger Hiss. I would suggest, therefore, Mr. President, that you simply pick up your phone and ask Mr. Acheson how many of those whom your board had labeled as dangerous Communists he failed to discharge. The day the House Un-American Activities Committee exposed Alger Hiss as an important link in an international Communist spy ring you signed an order forbidding the State Department's giving any information in regard to the disloyalty or the communistic connections of anyone in that Department to the Congress.

Despite this State Department black-out, we have been able to compile a list of 57 Communists in the State Department. This list is available to you but you can get a much longer list by ordering Secretary Acheson to give you a list of those whom your own board listed as being disloyal and who are still working in the State Department. I believe the following is the minimum which can be expected of you in this case.

1. That you demand that Acheson give you and the proper congressional committee the names and a complete report on all of those who were placed in the Department by Alger Hiss, and all of those still working in the State Department who were listed by your board as bad security risks because of their communistic connections.

2. That you promptly revoke the order in which you provided under no circumstances could a congressional committee obtain any information or help in exposing Communists.

Failure on your part will label the Democratic Party of being the bedfellow of international communism. Certainly this label is not deserved by the hundreds of thousands of loyal American Democrats throughout the Nation, and by the sizable number of able loyal Democrats in both the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, the only answer I have received to this telegram was the statement by the President at his press conference to the effect that there was not a word of truth in the telegram.

Subsequently, the Democratic leader of the Senate—at least, the alleged leader—made a speech in Chicago in which he repeated substantially what the President said, except that he went one step further and stated:

If I had said the nasty things that McCARTHY has about the State Department, I would be ashamed all my life.

He also said there was not a word of truth in my charge. I think it is unfortunate, not because I am concerned with what the senior Senator from Illinois happens to think, but because he occupies such an important position. I believe, if we are going to root out the fifth column in the State Department, we should have the wholehearted cooperation of both Democrats and Republicans——

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Wait until I finish. If the Senator will stay with me for the next few hours he will learn a great many facts. I have never refused to yield to any Senator, and I do not intend to refuse. The Senator from Illinois will have full time in which to answer any question he wishes to ask, but let me first finish my sentence.

I started to say that I think it is especially bad because it indicates a preconceived decision not to work with us in attempting to ferret out Communists. I do not feel that the Democratic Party has control of the executive branch of the Government any more. If it had, with the very able Members on the other side of the aisle, we would not find the picture which I intend to disclose. I think a group of twisted-thinking intellectuals have taken over both the Democratic and Republican Parties to try to wrest control from them.

I shall be glad now to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that there is no one in the Senate or in the country who is any more opposed to Communist domination of any nation or Communist infiltration into any country than is the Senator from Illinois. What I am asking the Senator to do—and I hope he will do it, and the country wants him to do it—is to follow through with the speech which he made in Wheeling, W. Va., in which he stated more than 200 persons working in the State Department were known to the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party. If the Senator made that statement—and that is what has been reported—I want him to name those Communists. If there are card-carrying Communists in the State Department, the Senator from Illinois will go along with the Senator from Wisconsin in any way possible to remove those Communists from the rolls.

The Senator does not have to do as he did in Salt Lake City and say, "I am not charging these four people with being Communists." The Senator is privileged to name them all in the Senate, and if those people are not Communists he will be protected. That is all I want the Senator to do. If the Senator names those 205 card-carrying Communists, and he proves to be right, the Senator from Illinois will apologize for anything he has said about the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his views, but I should like to assure him that I will not say anything on the Senate floor which I will not say off the floor. On the day when I take advantage of the security we have on the Senate floor, on that day I will resign from the Senate. Anything I say on the floor of the Senate at any time will be repeated off the floor.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Not until I have finished answering the question of the Senator from Illinois. The Senator called my attention to something, and I am glad he did; otherwise I might have overlooked it. Incidentally, the speech in Reno, Nev., and that in Wheeling, W. Va., were recorded, so there is no question about what I said. I do not believe I mentioned the figure 205. I believe I said "over 200." The President said, "It is just a lie. There is nothing to it."

I have before me a letter which was reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 1, 1946, at page A4892. It is a letter from James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State. It deals with the screening of the first group, of about 3,000. There were a great number of subsequent screenings. This was the beginning.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Please let me finish. The Senator will have all the time in the world to ask questions, and I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose, and he can even make short speeches and take all the time he wants.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not yield at this time.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. The letter deals with the first group of 3,000 which was screened. The President—and I think wisely so—set up a board to screen the employees who were coming to the State Department from the various war agencies of the War Department. There were thousands of unusual characters in some of those war agencies. Former Secretary Byrnes in his letter, which is reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says this:

Pursuant to Executive order, approximately 4,000 employees have been transferred to the Department of State from various war agencies such as the OSS, FEA, OWI, OIAA, and so forth. Of these 4,000 employees, the case histories of approximately 3,000 have been subjected to a preliminary examination, as a result of which a recommendation against permanent employment has been made in 285 cases by the screening committee to which you refer in your letter.

In other words, former Secretary Byrnes said that 285 of those men are unsafe risks. He goes on to say that of this number only 79 have been removed. Of the 57 I mentioned some are from this

group of 205, and some are from subsequent groups which have been screened but not discharged.

I might say in that connection that the investigative agency of the State Department has done an excellent job. The files show that they went into great detail in labeling Communists as such. The only trouble is that after the investigative agency had properly labeled these men as Communists the State Department refused to discharge them. I shall give detailed cases.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. As to the 57 whose names the Senator is demanding, if he will be patient and sit down——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the statements made, the Senator should yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield at this time only for a question. I shall not yield for any lengthy speeches by the Senator from Illinois. If he wishes to ask a question, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, did the Senator say at Wheeling, W. Va., last Thursday night that 205 persons working for the State Department were known by the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party, or words to that effect? Did he call the attention of the country to the fact that 205 men in the State Department were card-carrying Communists? Did the Senator say that? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD a copy of the speech which I made at Wheeling, W. Va.

Mr. LUCAS. Cannot the Senator answer "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will ask the Senator please not to interrupt me. I will yield to him later. I will give him all the chance in the world.

Mr. LUCAS. I asked the Senator a very simple question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask at this time unanimous consent to be allowed to insert in the RECORD a copy of the speech which I made at Wheeling, W. Va., and at Reno, Nev. It was the same speech.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCARTHY. In that case I shall read the speech into the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. We want to hear it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The speech reads:

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight as we celebrate the one hundred and forty-first birthday of one of the greatest men in American history, I would like to be able to talk about what a glorious day today is in the history of the world. As we celebrate the birth of this man who with his whole heart and soul hated war, I would like to be able to speak of peace in our time, of war being outlawed, and of world-wide disarmament. These would be truly appropriate things to be able to mention as we celebrate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

I hope the Senator from Illinois will stay for this.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be right here. I am coming over to the Republican side of the aisle so that I will not miss anything.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sure the Senator will not miss anything.

The speech proceeded:

Five years after a world war has been won, men's hearts should anticipate a long peace, and men's minds should be free from the heavy weight that comes with war. But this is not such a period—for this is not a period of peace. This is a time of the "cold war." This is a time when all the world is split into two vast, increasingly hostile armed camps—a time of a great armaments race.

Today we can almost physically hear the mutterings and rumblings of an invigorated god of war. You can see it, feel it, and hear it all the way from the hills of Indochina, from the shores of Formosa, right over into the very heart of Europe itself.

The one encouraging thing is that the "mad moment" has not yet arrived for the firing of the gun or the exploding of the bomb which will set civilization about the final task of destroying itself. There is still a hope for peace if we finally decide that no longer can we safely blind our eyes and close our ears to those facts which are shaping up more and more clearly. And that is that we are now engaged in a show-down fight—not the usual war between nations for land areas or other material gains, but a war between two diametrically opposed ideologies.

The great difference between our western Christian world and the atheistic Communist world is not political, ladies and gentlemen, it is moral. There are other differences, of course, but those could be reconciled. For instance, the Marxian idea of confiscating the land and factories and running the entire economy as a single enterprise is momentous. Likewise, Lenin's invention of the one-party police state as a way to make Marx's idea work is hardly less momentous.

Stalin's resolute putting across of these two ideas, of course, did much to divide the world. With only those differences, however, the East and the West could most certainly still live in peace.

The real, basic difference, however, lies in the religion of immoralism—invented by Marx, preached feverishly by Lenin, and carried to unimaginable extremes by Stalin. This religion of immoralism, if the Red half of the world wins—and well it may—this religion of immoralism will more deeply wound and damage mankind than any conceivable economic or political system.

Karl Marx dismissed God as a hoax, and Lenin and Stalin have added in clear-cut, unmistakable language their resolve that no nation, no people who believe in a God, can exist side by side with their communistic state.

Karl Marx, for example, expelled people from his Communist Party for mentioning such things as justice, humanity, or morality. He called this soulful ravings and sloppy sentimentality.

While Lincoln was a relatively young man in his late thirties, Karl Marx boasted that the Communist specter was haunting Europe. Since that time, hundreds of millions of people and vast areas of the world have fallen under Communist domination. Today, less than 100 years after Lincoln's death, Stalin brags that this Communist specter is not only haunting the world, but is about to completely subjugate it.

Today we are engaged in a final, all-out battle between communistic atheism and Christianity. The modern champions of communism have selected this as the time. And, ladies and gentlemen, the chips are down—they are truly down.

I might say for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois that what I am reading was taken from a recording of the speech. I did not use a written speech that night. I continue the reading:

Lest there be any doubt that the time has been chosen, let us go directly to the leader of communism today—Joseph Stalin. Here is what he said—not back in 1928, not before the war, not during the war—but 2 years after the last war was ended: "To think that the Communist revolution can be carried out peacefully, within the framework of a Christian democracy, means one has either gone out of one's mind and lost all normal understanding, or has grossly and openly repudiated the Communist revolution."

And this is what was said by Lenin in 1919, which was also quoted with approval by Stalin in 1947:

"We are living," said Lenin, "not merely in a state, but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with Christian states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the Bourgeois states will be inevitable."

Ladies and gentlemen, can there be anyone here tonight who is so blind as to say that the war is not on? Can there be anyone who fails to realize that the Communist world has said, "The time is now"—that this is the time for the show-down between the democratic Christian world and the Communist atheistic world?

Unless we face this fact, we shall pay the price that must be paid by those who wait too long.

Six years ago, at the time of the first conference to map out the peace—Dumbarton Oaks—there was within the Soviet orbit 180,000,000 people. Lined up on the antitotalitarian side there were in the world at that time roughly 1,625,000,000 people. Today, only 6 years later, there are 800,000,000 people under the absolute domination of Soviet Russia—an increase of over 400 percent. On our side, the figure has shrunk to around 500,000,000. In other words, in less than 6 years the odds have changed from 9 to 1 in our favor to 8 to 5 against us. This indicates the swiftness of the tempo of Communist victories and American defeats in the cold war. As one of our outstanding historical figures once said, "When a great democracy is destroyed, it will not be because of enemies from without, but rather because of enemies from within."

The truth of this statement is becoming terrifyingly clear as we see this country each day losing on every front.

At war's end we were physically the strongest nation on earth and, at least potentially, the most powerful intellectually and morally. Ours could have been the honor of being a beacon in the desert of destruction, a shining living proof that civilization was not yet ready to destroy itself. Unfortunately, we have failed miserably and tragically to arise to the opportunity.

The reason why we find ourselves in a position of impotency is not because our only powerful potential enemy has sent men to invade our shores, but rather because of the traitorous actions of those who have been treated so well by this Nation. It has not been the less fortunate or members of minority groups who have been selling this Nation out, but rather those who have had all the benefits that the wealthiest nation on earth has had to offer—the finest homes, the finest college education, and the finest jobs in Government we can give.

This is glaringly true in the State Department. There the bright young men who are born with silver spoons in their mouths are the ones who have been worst.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am interested in what he is saying, both as

a Senator and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. When the Senator casts doubt on the personnel of the State Department that, of course, is something which interests me very especially. I not only feel that there should be no Communists in the State Department, but that there should be nobody in the State Department who is not affirmatively, enthusiastically loyal to the United States and what it stands for. Therefore I say to the Senator from Wisconsin now, that so far as the junior Senator from Massachusetts is concerned, he will at the earliest appropriate opportunity make a motion to have a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee take up every single one of the accusations which the Senator from Wisconsin makes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was hoping the Senator would.

Mr. LODGE. I make that statement at this point, when the Senator from Wisconsin is beginning to speak about the State Department, because I think that I for one have a special responsibility in that field.

Mr. McCARTHY. In case the Senator from Massachusetts is not able to remain and listen to all of my remarks.

Mr. LODGE. I cannot remain and listen to the whole of the Senator's speech, because I have another engagement, but I shall read it all in the morning with the utmost care.

Mr. McCARTHY. In case the Senator must leave—and I say it will take me a long time to conclude, if I continue to have the interruptions I have previously had—I should like to call attention to three of the cases which I intend to cite: Case No. 1, case No. 2, and case No. 81. Those, I think, represent the big three. While there are vast numbers of other Communists with whom we must be concerned, if we can get rid of those big three we will have done something to break the back of the espionage ring within the State Department.

I might say also, in case the Senator will not be present to hear me, that in giving the records I have been very careful about doing two things: No. 1, not to cite anything which has not been confirmed by the intelligence agencies which have been investigating these men; and No. 2—and this I think is very important—I have tried, and I hope successfully, to red-pencil anything that might be embarrassing to any investigating agency. I know it is easy to call for files, and when I call for a disloyalty file I do not mean that I am calling for the source of information. I do not think any intelligence agency can work and do a good job if the Senate or the House, or any other body is entitled to make public the source of the information. The files which I have here show the source of the information. I contacted one of the Federal intelligence agencies, one of the investigative units. I asked them if they would care to go over what I have to say before I say it, and red-pencil anything which they thought might in any way divulge the source of information, that would in any way inform the Communist spy ring of the information they have. The answer was, "Well, you have gotten all of it from the State Department files, and the Communists within the Department can see those files, and I will show you which Commies have the top-secret clearance, so if they have seen it, it does not do much damage for the Senate to see them."

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am not undertaking to say whether he is right or wrong. I have no way of knowing that. What I say is that the matter he is discussing is of such vital importance that I think it ought to be investigated by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I say with my whole heart, I hope I am wrong. There is nothing as disturbing as is this picture. But if I am wrong, I shall be very happy indeed to know that I am.

Mr. LODGE. I say to the Senator that I shall do all I can to leave no stone unturned to get to the bottom of the matter.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot yield any further.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps I can save some time. The Senator from Wisconsin in his discussion with the Senator from Massachusetts said that he had a long speech and had to read it. If the Senator will answer my question, perhaps we can save some time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot yield at this time for the Senator's question. I cannot yield for that purpose until I complete the speech.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska if I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the proceedings. I am perfectly willing to cooperate with the majority leader in every way. But when I look around the Senate Chamber I see only two or three Senators on the other side of the aisle, and half a dozen on this side of the aisle. The matter seems to me to be of such importance——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska and I are present.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; but I believe more Senators should be present. I believe more Senators should be on the floor to hear this statement. I do not want to interfere with the majority leader's program, but I ask him if we cannot take a recess at this time, or, if necessary, have a quorum call to bring Senators back to the Senate Chamber so they can hear the speech being made by the Senator from Wisconsin. It seems to me the only sensible thing to do at this time is to take a recess or have a quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. As I look around the Senate Chamber I see about as many Senators present as I usually see present when a speech is being made. Last Friday we discussed the creation of a Small-Business Committee all afternoon, and at times only 3 Senators were present. The resolution then before the Senate was a very important one. I believe there are perhaps 25 or 30 Senators now present. That is as many as would remain after we have a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, if the Senator from Illinois feels that way.

Mr. LUCAS. I am perfectly satisfied to sit here and listen.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps the majority leader is, but I say that a very important speech is being made. Terrific challenges are being hurled. I am perfectly willing to stay until 9 o'clock, but I submit to the majority leader that I feel more Senators ought to be on the floor if the Senator from Wisconsin is going to proceed with his speech.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCARTHY. If that is done I do not think we will obtain a quorum, and I will be obliged to discontinue. I should like to read some more of my speech.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that we proceed until 7 o'clock without having a quorum call, and at that time the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow, and that then I may have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that what has now been suggested is what is often suggested under similar circumstances. Let me remind the Senate that on the request of certain Democratic and Republican Members I made the announcement that there would be no vote tonight on the important measure which is now pending, the cotton-potato measure. Consequently many Senators have gone home. Now the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the minority leader, and others, do not want the Senator from Wisconsin to continue. They want a quorum call. The Senator from Wisconsin now asks that he be allowed to quit at 7 o'clock. If the speech is one which is going to electrify the Nation, I should think the Senator from Wisconsin would desire to get it off his chest as fast as he possibly can, and not wait until tomorrow, because tomorrow the Senator will have no larger audience than he has at the present time. I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that if the statement he is about to make is as important as he says it is, and if he can prove what he says he is going to prove, he will find the Senator from Illinois making the same demand that the Senator from Massachusetts made, which is a thorough and complete investigation with respect to all the Communists he is going to name. I want to remain here until he names them. That is what I am interested in. The newspaper reporters and the people of the country generally are demanding to know who these 207 or 201 Communists are.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I will not yield any further.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order to straighten out the record respecting the program for tomorrow?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we already have a special order that the Senate will meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning under a unanimous-consent agreement, with the time for a vote having been set. Therefore it would not be possible for the Senator to continue his speech as of 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well. I will withhold yielding for a call of a quorum for the time being, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. President, I continue to read from my speech:

Now I know it is very easy for anyone to condemn a particular bureau or department in general terms. Therefore, I would like to cite one rather unusual case—the case of a man who has done much to shape our foreign policy.

When Chiang Kai-shek was fighting our war, the State Department had in China a young man named John S. Service. His task, obviously, was not to work for the communization of China. Strangely, however, he sent official reports back to the State Department urging that we torpedo our ally Chiang Kai-shek and stating, in effect, that communism was the best hope of China.

Later, this man—John Service—was picked up by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for turning over to the Communists secret State Department information. Strangely, however, he was never prosecuted. However, Joseph Grew, the Under Secretary of State, who insisted on his prosecution, was forced to resign. Two days after Grew's successor, Dean Acheson, took over as Under Secretary of State, this man—John Service—who had been picked up by the FBI and who had previously urged that communism was the best hope of China, was not only reinstated in the State Department but promoted. And finally, under Acheson, placed in charge of all placements and promotions.

Today, ladies and gentlemen, this man Service is on his way to represent the State Department and Acheson in Calcutta—by far and away the most important listening post in the Far East.

Now, let's see what happens when individuals with Communist connections are forced out of the State Department. Gustave Duran, who was labeled as (I quote) "a notorious international Communist," was made assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American affairs. He was taken into the State Department from his job as a lieutenant colonel in the Communist International Brigade. Finally, after intense congressional pressure and criticism, he resigned in 1946 from the State Department—and, ladies and gentlemen, where do you think he is now? He took over a high-salaried job as Chief of Cultural Activities Section in the office of the Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact—especially in view of the comment he recently made—that I did not list John Service as one of the 57. Perhaps I could have, but I have listed only persons whose files were available to me. For some unknown reason, John Service's file has disappeared in the State Department. I have tried to find where it is, and I have been told that it is in the office—quoting the individual over there—"of the top brass." So I have not listed Service, and that is the sole reason why I have not. I have listed only individuals whose records have been confirmed by the President's own investigative agency.

The Senator from Illinois will also note that I have not named any of the 57. I have named or will name four individuals, and I have given or will give their records. One is John Service. I have shown what influence he has had in the Far East. I have not reached the second one yet; but I am now discussing what happens when those with communistic connections are forced out of the State Department, and in a short time I shall reach the fourth one.

I read further from my speech:

Then there was a Mrs. Mary Jane Kenny, from the Board of Economic Warfare in the State Department, who was named in an FBI report and in a House committee report as a courier for the Communist Party while working for the Government. And where do you think Mrs. Kenny is—she is now an editor in the United Nations Document Bureau.

Another interesting case was that of Julian H. Wadleigh, economist in the Trade Agreements Section of the State Department for 11 years and was sent to Turkey and Italy and other countries as United States representative. After the statute of limitations had run so he could not be prosecuted for treason, he openly and brazenly not only admitted but proclaimed that he had been a member of the Communist Party * * * that while working for the State Department he stole a vast number of secret documents * * * and furnished these documents to the Russian spy ring of which he was a part.

You will recall last spring there was held in New York what was known as the World Peace Conference—a conference which was labeled by the State Department and Mr. Truman as the sounding board for Communist propaganda and a front for Russia. Dr. Harlow Shapley was the chairman of that conference. Interestingly enough, according to the new release put out by the Department in July, the Secretary of State appointed Shapley on a commission which acts as liaison between UNESCO and the State Department.

That is the man who headed the conference which the Secretary of State said was a tool of Communist Russia, a sounding board of Communist propaganda. Again, that man was not named as one of the 57, but he might well have been.

I read further:

This, ladies and gentlemen, gives you somewhat of a picture of the type of individuals who have been helping to shape our foreign policy. In my opinion the State Department, which is one of the most important government departments, is thoroughly infested with Communists.

I have in my hand 57 cases of individuals who would appear to be either card carrying members or certainly loyal to the Communist Party, but who nevertheless are still helping to shape our foreign policy.

One thing to remember in discussing the Communists in our Government is that we are not dealing with spies who get 30 pieces of silver to steal the blueprints of a new weapon. We are dealing with a far more sinister type of activity because it permits the enemy to guide and shape our policy.

In that connection, I would like to read to you very briefly from the testimony of Larry E. Kerley, a man who was with the counter espionage section of the FBI for 8 years. And keep in mind as I read this to you that at the time he is speaking, there was in the State Department Alger Hiss, the convicted Alger Hiss; John Service, the man whom the FBI picked up for espionage—

And for turning over secret documents—

Julian Wadleigh, who brazenly admitted he was a spy and wrote newspaper articles in regard thereto, plus hundreds of other bad security risks.

The FBI, I may add, has done an outstanding job, as all persons in Washington, Democrats and Republicans alike, agree. If J. Edgar Hoover had a free hand, we would not be plagued by Hisses and Wadleighs in high positions of power in the State Department. The FBI has only power to investigate.

Here is what the FBI man said.

Mr. President, let me point out solely for the record something which I know Senators are well aware of, but something which causes confusion in the minds of many persons throughout the United States, namely, that the FBI has no power other than to investigate. People often write to Senators, and say in their letters, "With a man like J. Edgar Hoover at the head of the FBI, how is it that this situation exists?" For their benefit I think it should be stated that the FBI has no power whatever except to dig up facts and report them to the Department of Justice or other executive agencies.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On that point, let me inquire whether it is also true that the Secretary of State has the sole power to discharge, without trial, anyone in the State Department whom he thinks might be disloyal.

Mr. McCARTHY. I so understand—under the McCarran amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, under the McCarran Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. I so understand; and I understand that it applies both to employees of the State Department and to civil-service employees.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it is not necessary for a trial to be held in such cases, but the Secretary of State has full power to discharge, and that power was given to him in 1946; was it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and I intend to call attention to it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not until I finish reading this statement. I shall be glad, when I finish reading it, to yield to the Senator.

I read further from the statement, reading what was said by the FBI man:

In accordance with instructions of the State Department to the FBI, the FBI was not even permitted to open an espionage case against any Russia suspect without State Department approval.

Incidentally, Mr. President, this was testimony given at a hearing of a Senate subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

I read further:

Mr. ARENS. Did the State Department ever withhold from the Justice Department the right to intern suspects?

Mr. KERLEY. They withheld the right to get out process for them which, in effect, kept them from being arrested, as in the case of Schevchenko and others.

Mr. ARENS. In how many instances did the State Department decline to permit process to be served on Soviet agents?

Mr. KERLEY. Do you mean how many Soviet agents were affected?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mr. KERLEY. That would be difficult to say because there were so many people connected in one espionage ring, whether or not they were directly conspiring with the ring.

Mr. ARENS. Was that order applicable to all persons?

Mr. KERLEY. Yes; all persons in the Soviet-espionage organization.

Mr. ARENS. What did you say the order was as you understood it or as it came to you?

Mr. KERLEY. That no arrests of any suspects in the Russian-espionage activities in the United States were to be made without the prior approval of the State Department.

That means the prior approval of the Alger Hisses and the Wadleighs in the State Department.

I read further:

Now the reason for the State Department's opposition to arresting any of this spy ring is made rather clear in the next question and answer.

"Senator O'CONOR. Did you understand that that was to include also American participants?

"Mr. KERLEY. Yes; because if they were arrested that would disclose the whole apparatus, you see."

Meaning the whole apparatus both inside and outside the State Department.

I read further:

In other words they could not afford to let the whole ring which extended into the State Department be exposed.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at this time. The Senator has insisted that I read this statement, and I shall read all of it before I yield.

I now read further:

This brings us down to the case of one Alger Hiss who is important not as an individual any more, but rather because he is so representative of a group in the State Department. It is unnecessary to go over the sordid events showing how he sold out the Nation which had given him so much. Those are rather fresh in all of our minds.

However, it should be remembered that the facts in regard to his connection with this international Communist spy ring were made known to the then Under Secretary of State Berle 3 days after Hitler and Stalin signed the Russo-German alliance pact. At that time one Whittaker Chambers—who was also part of the spy ring—apparently decided that with Russia on Hitler's side, he could no longer betray our Nation to Russia. He gave Under Secretary of State Berle—and this is all a matter of record—practically all, if not more, of the facts upon which Hiss' conviction was based.

Under Secretary Berle promptly contacted Dean Acheson and received word in return that Acheson (and I quote) "could vouch for Hiss absolutely"—at which time the matter was dropped. And this, you understand, was at a time when Russia was an ally of Germany. This condition existed while Russia and Germany were invading and dismembering Poland, and while the Communist groups here were screaming "warmonger" at the United States for their support of the allied nations.

Again in 1943, the FBI had occasion to investigate the facts surrounding Hiss' contacts with the Russian spy ring. But even after that FBI report was submitted, nothing was done.

Then late in 1948—on August 5—when the Un-American Activities Committee called Alger Hiss to give an accounting, President Truman at once issued a Presidential directive ordering all Government agencies to refuse to turn over any information whatsoever in regard to the Communist activities of any Government employee to a congressional committee.

Incidentally, even after Hiss was convicted—

The statement should have been "even after Hiss was indicted"—

it is interesting to note that the President still labeled the exposé of Hiss as a "red herring."

If time permitted, it might be well to go into detail about the fact that Hiss was Roosevelt's chief adviser at Yalta when Roosevelt was admittedly in ill health and tired physically and mentally * * * and when, according to the Secretary of State, Hiss and Gromyko drafted the report on the conference.

That is not entirely correct; actually the report on the conference was drafted by Hiss, Gromyko, and an Englishman whose name I cannot now recall.

Mr. MUNDT. It was Gladwyn Jebb.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what I understood the Senator to say previously.

I read further:

According to the then Secretary of State Stettinius, here are some of the things that Hiss helped to decide at Yalta. (1) The establishment of a European High Commission; (2) the treatment of Germany—this you will recall was the conference at which it was decided that we would occupy Berlin with Russia occupying an area completely circling the city, which, as you know, resulted in the Berlin airlift which cost 31 American lives; (3) the Polish question; (4) the relationship between UNRRA and the Soviet; (5) the rights of Americans on control commissions of Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary; (6) Iran; (7) China—here's where we gave away Manchuria; (8) Turkish Straits question; (9) international trusteeships; (10) Korea.

Of the results of this conference, Arthur Bliss Lane of the State Department had this to say: "As I glanced over the document, I could not believe my eyes. To me, almost every line spoke of a surrender to Stalin."

As you hear this story of high treason, I know that you are saying to yourself, "Well, why doesn't the Congress do something about it?" Actually, ladies and gentlemen, one of the important reasons for the graft, the corruption, the dishonesty, the disloyalty, the treason in high Government positions—one of the most important reasons why this continues is a lack of moral uprising on the part of the 140,000,000 American people. In the light of history, however, this is not hard to explain.

It is the result of an emotional hang-over and a temporary moral lapse which follows every war. It is the apathy to evil which people who have been subjected to the tremendous evils of war feel. As the people of the world see mass murder, the destruction of defenseless and innocent people, and all of the crime and lack of morals which go with war, they become numb and apathetic. It has always been thus after war.

However, the morals of our people have not been destroyed. They still exist. This cloak of numbness and apathy has only needed a spark to rekindle them. Happily, this spark has finally been supplied.

As you know, very recently the Secretary of State proclaimed his loyalty to a man guilty of what has always been considered as the most abominable of all crimes—of being a traitor to the people who gave him a position of great trust. The Secretary of State in attempting to justify his continued devotion to the man who sold out the Christian world to the atheistic world, referred to Christ's Sermon on the Mount as a justification and reason therefor, and the reaction of the American people to this would have made the heart of Abraham Lincoln happy.

When this pompous diplomat in striped pants, with a phony British accent, proclaimed to the American people that Christ on the Mount endorsed communism, high treason, and betrayal of a sacred trust, the blasphemy was so great that it awakened the dormant indignation of the American people.

He has lighted the spark which is resulting in a moral uprising and will end only when the whole sorry mess of twisted, warped thinkers are swept from the national scene so that we may have a new birth of national honesty and decency in Government.

Mr. President, that answers the question of the Senator from Illinois as to the number of Communists I stated were in the State Department. I have stated I have the names of 57. Let me make it clear that I do not claim to know all the Communists in the State Department. I do not have any counter-espionage group that can go there and ferret out all the information. I have also pointed out that the State Department refused to discharge—and so stated in a press conference—205 individuals who, its own security agency said, were unsafe risks. If the Senator has any further questions, I shall be glad to yield.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I now repeat the same question I asked the able Senator in the beginning: Did the Senator from Wisconsin, in a speech at Wheeling, W. Va., Thursday, February 9, declare that he had a list of 205 persons working for the State Department, who were known by the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say, if the Senator is going to make a farce of this, I will not yield to him.

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I told him three times. I read the speech to him. I told him I said there were 57 Communists in the State Department. I told him there were in the State Department 205, who, according to the President's own Security Board, are unsafe risks. They said, "Mr. Secretary, fire these men. Discharge them." He refused to do it. I quoted Secretary Byrnes' letter, telling him to do that. I shall not answer any more silly questions of the Senator. This is too important, too serious a matter for that. I am trying to get down to the point of showing the Senate cases, facts, and dates, so that the President will admit that he was wrong, and I hope the Senator from Illinois will admit that he went off half cocked in Illinois the other day when he said, as the President said, this is all lies, and tried to prejudge the case.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. This is pretty serious to the Senator from Illinois, and it is serious to the Senate, and it is serious to the country. The only thing I am asking the able Senator is whether the newspapers misquoted him. The newspapers quoted him, and there is an editorial in the Washington Post, which is libelous if not true, in which the Senator is quoted in his speech at Wheeling, W. Va., as saying that he had a list of 205 persons working for the State Department who were carrying Communist cards. What I want to know is merely one simple thing. I did not find anything in the speech to bear out what the newspaper reported to be true. The Senator keeps talking about 57; the newspaper says the Senator said there were 205. That represents quite a difference, and it is of importance, whether the Senator from Wisconsin made the statement or did not make it. He can answer yes or no to that. He may say that in his speech he did not make that statement; he may have made it in a conference of some kind. But it was carried all over the country, through the Washington newspapers, the New York newspapers, and the Chicago newspapers, that the Senator said he could name the 205 who were carrying Communist cards. It may be a silly question in the eyes of the Senator from Wisconsin, and that, as he said, I am trying to make a farce out of this thing, but it is a serious charge; the Senate and the country are entitled to know the facts.

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

Mr. LUCAS. It is serious to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer the Senator's question, for the third time. I will tell the Senator, and I am now repeating it, if the Senator will sit down and give me the time to do it, that there are at least 57 Communists in the State Department. I think, without any trouble at all, with sufficient investigation, we can find the 205 for the Senator. As to what the Washington Post says, I do not know, and I frankly do not care. I think that is clear. I will not answer the Senator a fourth time. I said that I made speeches. I have said there were 57 Communists in the State Department. I wired the President to that effect.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not yielding to the Senator now. I have wired the President to that effect, and I told him those names were available to him. I am now going to give the Senate of the United States the facts, and I refuse to go further into the question raised by the Senator from Illinois. Let me tell him now, so there may be no question in his mind, I said 57 Communists were in the State Department. I said there were 205 in the State Department whom the Secretary of State refused to discharge, although his loyalty board said, "Discharge those men." Now, is that clear to the Senator?

Mr. LUCAS. If that is what the Senator is saying, I can understand; but what I am trying to find out is whether newspapers have deliberately distorted what the able Senator said in his speech.

Mr. McCARTHY. I refuse to yield further to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to find out.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. For a question, certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand the Senator to claim he has submitted the names of the 57 cases to which he refers and the 205 names which are referred to, not only in the Washington Post but in a number of other newspapers, to the State Department? Does he claim he has submitted the names of 57 and 205, or any substantial number?

Mr. McCARTHY. The answer to the Senator is, "No." The answer is "No."

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does not the Senator believe that, interested as he is in combatting communism, and we are all interested in combatting communism, that it is his duty both as a Senator of the United States and as an American to submit those names to the State Department or to the Senate, in executive session?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will but sit down and let me make my report to the Senate, he will have all the information he wants. The Senator from Wisconsin does not need any advice on his duty as a Senator, in this respect.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. No, not now; not until I give some of the information the Senator is asking for. I will not yield for another 15 or 20 minutes, until I can get down to the information which I am trying to give the Senate. I will not yield any further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield later to the Senator.

Mr. President, I am going to have difficulty talking, while the Senators are chatting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield for 5 or 10 minutes to let the Senators carry on their conversation.

Mr. President, I have before me information from the State Department files, information which the President says the Senate did not have. Having this information, it is a serious question as to what should be done with it. I originally thought possibly we could hope for some cooperation from the State Department and the President. However, in going over the material and finding that all of it, of course, has been available to the State Department, for it is all from their files, it seemed that nothing would be gained by calling it to their attention again. The President, I felt, had demonstrated his lack of interest quite thoroughly during all the Hiss investigation. Then, when I sent him a telegram and said, "Mr. President, I have the 57 names; they are yours if you want them"; and when he answered by calling me a liar, I felt I could get no cooperation from the President.

Then, when the majority leader, without even discussing the matter with me, though he knew I had stated that I had the information, he made a speech in Illinois and prejudged the case, without hearing the evidence, and said, "The Senator from Wisconsin is a liar," I felt I could get no cooperation from the majority leader. It was then suggested that I ask the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to go into the matter and that I submit the names to that committee. I talked to some of the members of the committee. They thought perhaps the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Foreign Relations, or both committees jointly might have jurisdiction, and they thought it should be discussed with them.

I discussed it with a number of the individuals who have been interested in the subject, digging up this information. They felt that under the present circumstances the committee could do very little, because, if we gave the committee the names and the information, and the President said, "You cannot get any information from the State Department files," they would be hamstrung. It was suggested that I draft a resolution providing that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or some other committee, should have the right to subpena the secret State Department files. That sounds all right on the face of it, Mr. President, but it is dangerous to go that far.

As is well known, during the Coplon trial the judge ordered the FBI to submit all its secret files, including the sources of information. That information was made public, and a number of men in the FBI have stated that it set the FBI back 10 years. It endangered the security of some of their best men.

I finally arrived at the conclusion that the only way to clean out the State Department, or any other Department which is infested with Communists, is not by the passage of any additional law. The only way it can be done is to secure the cooperation of the President. If we could get that, and he says that the information will be made available so that trusted staff members could go over the files, and we can be sure that the sources of information shall not be disclosed, we can clean house. I frankly think that is the only way. In line with that, I decided to submit to the Senate the detailed cases. Originally I was disturbed that I might give out information which would embarrass the investigative agencies by indirectly disclosing some of their sources of information, but I was told, "With so many commies over here having top positions, you need not fear giving the information to the Senate."

I have gone over it. Let me say, before starting, that I shall submit quite a large number of names. I think they are of importance. They all worked for the State Department at one time or another. Some are not there at the present time. Many of them have gone into work which is connected closely with the Department, for example, foreign trade,

and some branches of the Maritime Commission.

I shall not attempt to present a detailed case on each one, a case which would convince a jury. All I am doing is to develop sufficient evidence so that anyone who reads the RECORD will have a good idea of the number of Communists in the State Department.

While I consider them all important, there are three big Communists involved, and I cannot possibly conceive of any Secretary of State allowing those three big Communists, who are tremendously important and of great value to Russia, to remain in the State Department. I do not believe President Truman knows about them. I cannot help but feel that he is merely the prisoner of a bunch of twisted intellectuals who tell him what they want him to know. To those who say, "Why do you not tell the State Department; why do you not give the names to the State Department?" I say that everything I have here is from the State Department's own files. I felt, when the State Department asked for the names, without being willing to cooperate or to work with us, it was saying, "Tip us off; let us know on whom you have the goods."

Case No. 1. The names are available. The Senators may have them if they care for them. I think, however, it would be improper to make the names public until the appropriate Senate committee can meet in executive session and get them. I have approximately 81 cases. I do not claim to have any tremendous investigative agency to get the facts, but if I were to give all the names involved, it might leave a wrong impression. If we should label one man a Communist when he is not a Communist, I think it would be too bad. However, the names are here. I shall be glad to abide by the decision of the Senate after it hears the cases, but I think the sensible thing to do would be to have an executive session and have a proper committee go over the whole situation.

I was very happy to hear the Senator from Massachusetts say that he would move that the Foreign Relations Committee appoint a subcommittee to go into the cases.

The man involved in case No. 1 is employed in the office of an Assistant Secretary of State. The intelligence unit shadowed him and found him contacting members of an espionage group. A memorandum of December 13, 1946, indicates that he succeeded in having a well-known general intervene with an Assistant Secretary in behalf of one man who is an active Communist with a long record of Communist Party connections. There is another individual who is very closely tied up with a Soviet espionage agency. There is nothing in the file to indicate that the general referred to knew those two individuals were Communists.

That is a part of the usual modus operandi. If there is one Communist in the Department, he will get some other individual to recommend another Communist so that the breed can be increased.

This individual was successful in obtaining important positions for other Communists. They were finally ordered removed from the Department not later than November 15 of the following year. Subsequent to that time, however, both of them still had access to secret material.

A memorandum of November 2, 1946, pointed out that this individual and the previously mentioned Communists whom he succeeded in having placed were connected with an alleged Russian espionage agency. Nevertheless, this individual still occupies an important position in the State Department. I should like to point out at this time, however, that the security group, which was then operating in the State Department, was apparently doing a good job. It presented the entire picture to the Secretary of State. This individual who, the investigative agency of the State Department says, is a Communist, got a general innocently to bring two other Communists into the State Department, and he is today in the State Department and has access to the secret material. As I say, his name is certainly available to any Senate committee that wants it.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator tell us the name of the man for the record? We are entitled to know who he is. I say this in all seriousness. The Senate and the public are entitled to know who that man is, as a result of the charge made by my friend. If he is a Communist, the Senator from Wisconsin knows that the Senator from Illinois will go right along with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator can come to my office as soon as I finish and receive the names. I intend to go through all the cases. If it is the judgment of the Senate that it wants the names exposed on the Senate floor, which would be a very unusual procedure, I shall be glad to expose them. The question is too important for either the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Wisconsin to make the decision. If any Senate committee is actually interested in disclosing the names——

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Committee on the Judiciary has been investigating communism more than half the year. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is entirely correct. We have never made a name public unless we had the consent of J. Edgar Hoover. I, for one, want to be recorded as absolutely agreeing with the Senator from Wisconsin.

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

The Senator from Illinois knows there is nothing secret about the names that he cannot have. I do not like this political byplay. If we continue as we have been going, the next war will be lost before we start. I heard a commentator last night say that Russia has 1,200 divisions, and he stated that there were 54,000 troops in Albania, indicating that Russia is about to start the fighting part of the next war.

It is tremendously important that we clean out the espionage ring in our State Department.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I cannot yield at this time.

This is a case to which I particularly invite the Senate's attention. The files show two very interesting facts. A major portion of the file was removed. Papers refer to information in the file which is nonexistent. Upon contact with the keeper of the records, he stated that, to the best of his knowledge, the major portion of the file had been removed. He did not mention any name, but he said, "He was put in some high-brass job about 2 years ago."

I am inclined to think that this individual's name may be known from the information which I shall give here.

The file shows two things. It shows, first, that this individual had some of his clothing picked up, with unusual material in it, and, second—and this is important—it shows that the State Department and the President had prepared material which was to be sent to a foreign government. The file shows that before the material left the State Department it was in the hands of the Kremlin in Moscow. Do Senators follow me? The State Department's own investigative file shows that some secret material, which was being transmitted to another nation, before it even left this country for the other country, showed up in Moscow. So far, that is not too significant. However, the file shows that this particular individual, who has held one of the most important positions at one of the listening posts in Europe, was shadowed, that he was found to have contacted a Soviet agent, and that the Soviet agent was then followed to the Soviet Embassy, where the agent turned the material over to the Soviet Embassy. Do Senators follow me? This is what the secret State Department file shows: First, the papers get to Moscow in some mysterious manner, and, second, this individual, who is now one of our foreign ministers, contacts a Russian espionage agent, and that agent is followed to the Russian Embassy, where the material is handed over. This is no secret to the State Department.

Incidentally, I might say that I promised the press I would have copies of this material for their use. However, in view of the fact that I have nothing completely ready at this time, and must refer to the documents before me, which I cannot turn over to the press, I do not have anything to give them. I am sorry. I shall try, however, to give them now the material I have, and shall try to make the dates and places as clear as I can.

Case No. 3. This individual was born in Flushing, N. Y., in 1903. He was employed with OSS in 1942. In 1945 he was transferred to the State Department and assigned to Research and Intelligence. The State Department's file shows that he is a member of a number of Communist-front organizations, and that his pals are known Communists. The file further shows that this fact is admitted by him. The original report in

which this information is contained is dated July 3, 1942. The security report of April 18, 1946, indicates that numerous witnesses, including college professors and police officers in California, testified he was a radical and a fellow traveler. He was very friendly and sympathetic toward Harry Bridges, and strongly opposed any move to deport Bridges. The report also shows that he was also a close friend of Ralph Friedman, secretary of the Communist Party in California. Another security report, dated November 13, 1946, quotes his associates as saying that he favored the Chinese Communists in China and favored Russia in most respects.

The State Department officials themselves, according to this report, describe him as being overly sympathetic to Russia and the Communist experiment. This is all a part of the report. Another Government official said the individual frequently blamed the capitalists for all the trouble in Russia, and constantly praised Russia as the ideal. So far as I know, everything in this individual's file indicates that he is actively working with and for the Communists.

Case No. 4. The individual came to the United States from Hungary in 1944. He was employed as a translator and script writer for OWI, and later by the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. The report of January 3, 1947, indicates that he is an active member of a Communist front organization, and that he lost his former job because of his constant arguments in favor of communism. A former employer, according to the file, stated that this individual boasted of being a member of the Communist Party. A third informant also stated that this individual boasted of his Communist connections and argued that communism was superior to democracy. The fourth informant said that he constantly argued politics, and that communism was the ideal system for this country. Two of the references on his application for citizenship were members of at least one Communist-front organization and contributors to Communist periodicals. Another reference refused to recommend him, questioning his loyalty, and saying that he was a Communist. Another reference, of April 24, 1947, showed that this employee's supervisor in the State Department felt he was a fellow-traveler. This individual has been contributing to the Hungarian Communist magazine, N. O. K.

Various memoranda and reports by the State Department Security Agency in the files indicate that no one was found to question this employee's communistic connection and beliefs.

Case No. 5. This case serves as a very good example of the failure on the part of the State Department to take any action even after conclusive evidence of a person's Communist activity was shown by the State Department's own security agency. He was born in North Carolina in 1900. He was employed by the Foreign Economic Administration from August 1942, to August 1945, and was then transferred to the State Department and placed on Research and Intelligence.

I should like to call attention, Mr. President, to the number of these individuals who succeeded in getting into Research and Intelligence. Research and Intelligence, the Voice of America, and Far Eastern Affairs seem to be the three prime targets.

The report dated May 4, 1946, in this man's file shows that eight persons, including six college professors at Harvard University and the University of California, agreed that this individual has strong communistic leanings, and that in their opinion he was either a card-carrying member of the Communist Party or a fellow-traveler. That is the opinion of six professors at Harvard University and the University of California. Some of the opinions expressed by his associates might well be read.

A professor at the University of California stated that he was acquainted with this individual since September 1937; that he did not trust him; he considered him in the class of Harry Bridges; that under no circumstances would he hire him, and also that there was something about him that aroused his intuition, and caused him to be afraid of his outside connections, and under no circumstances would he recommend him to the Government.

A fellow student stated that he had known him since 1939 and that he knew him definitely as a Communist; that he felt that this individual was getting money from the Communist Party, and the other students did also, because they would say that this individual was not preaching communism for his health, but that it was a business with him; that he would not recommend this individual to the Government because he feels that he is a Communist.

This individual was discharged from a Navy school during the war for bad grades and for Communist activities. A memorandum, dated May 15, 1946, from CSA to the Office of Controls, states that an "investigation discloses evidence of a material nature tending to affect adversely the loyalty to the United States and its institutions." This report reveals that this individual is unmistakeably identified with communistic activities. While the records of the Bureau of Naval Personnel show that he was given a special order discharge in March 27, 1942, under honorable conditions, evidence in his file, all of which is, of course, available to the Secretary of State, reveals that he was discharged because it was found that he was an ardent student of and advocate of communism.

A report, dated March 25, 1947, indicates that this individual had been receiving mail from the Soviet Embassy, as well as communistic publications. An official of a Washington, D. C. university stated that he had hired this individual to conduct a class in Chinese, but later learned that he was closely connected with communistic groups on the west coast. Four members of the faculty at the University of California confirmed this individual's communistic leanings. All of the above information was brought to the attention of the top officials in the State Department in a memorandum summarizing the case in 1947, with the recommendation that he be immediately discharged. The State Department refused to discharge him because it was not proven that he had committed any overt act. Subsequent to this time, this individual argued often and heatedly in favor of a Communist regime in China. He admitted having been a subscriber to the Daily Worker.

Let me repeat for the benefit of the Senate, the State Department refused to discharge this individual because he had not been shown to have committed any overt act, despite the fact that the State Department's own security agency had in a report stated that he was unmistakably identified with communistic activities; despite the fact that he had been dicharged from a Navy school because he was an ardent student and advocate of communistic doctrine; despite the fact that he had been receiving mail from the Soviet Embassy, as well as being a subscriber to the Daily Worker; despite the fact that six professors at Harvard and the University of California agreed that he was a "party member or fellow traveler"; despite the fact that a fellow student who knew him well stated that he would not recommend him for a job in the Government because of his communistic activities. This man, the State Department says, must be kept on because he has committed no "overt" act.

The State Department's own Security Board then submitted four subsequent reports, the first one dated September 12, 1947, in an attempt to convince the Department that this man was dangerous and should be discharged. Subsequently this man's position was abolished. However, he was not discharged. Listen to this. His position was abolished, but what happened then? He was transferred to the Division of Research, replacing an employee who, so far as I can learn, had an excellent record, and whose loyalty was in no way questioned. This in spite of the fact that a State Department official who knew him and worked with him in China as well as in this country, said he was—and this is what a State Department official said about this man, whom the Department refused to discharge, whom they shifted over to another job where he bumped another worker—the State Department official said he was mediocre, dull, and incompetent. So his only qualification was his communistic connections. This same State Department official said, "This is the only man in the Government of whom I would speak unfavorably."

Keep in mind that under the McCarran bill, a very wise piece of legislation, the Secretary of State has the absolute unquestioned right to discharge a man of this kind. So the Secretary could have discharged him as first recommended. Four times bluntly they have said, "Get rid of this man." His superior officer says he is dull and incompetent, but for some reason or other he is still kept on.

Another State Department official said that he considered this individual extremely weak as to ability. I believe it is unnecessary to comment on the attitude of the State Department in this case. Certainly it is an attitude which frightens me and bodes ill for the future of the United States.

Another one is case No. 6. This individual is with the Division of Central Services. A security report dated December 31, 1946, describes her as being "pink" and as advocating that we substitute conditions in Russia for those in the United States. She takes a very active part in the conferences of the UPWA, which has been picked up by the CIO, actively opposed the President's loyalty order, but has been given top secret clearance. This individual has a right to see all the top secret documents.

Case No. 7. This individual was an associate business economist to August 1944; with FEA from August 1944 to August 1945, and then transferred to the State Department as an economist. This individual is a member of the Young Communist League. He was affiliated with four other organizations which are named by the Attorney General as having been Communist fronts. This individual admits membership in the Young Communists, and in the other Communist-front organizations, but claims to have changed his view since that time, and therefore was given top secret clearance by the State Department. I may say incidentally I am using the pronoun "he" in all these cases, although some of the individuals are not of the male sex.

Case No. 8. This individual was born in New York City in 1918. He was employed as an economist and analyst with the OSS in the State Department from June 1945. Previous to that time he worked for the War Production Board. He was assigned again to Research and Intelligence in the State Department. This man, according to the State Department files, was an active member of a number of Communist-front organizations, was a very close friend of several men who are under suspicion by the FBI of being connected with Russian espionage cases and has two brothers who have been openly working for the Communist Party.

I may say that I know that some of these individuals whose cases I am giving the Senate are no longer in the State Department. A sizable number of them are not. Some of them have transferred to other Government work, work allied with the State Department. Others have been transferred to the United Nations. But I think the cases are important whenever we find that an individual, despite his Communist connections, has been given top-secret clearance. That gives an idea what is going on.

Here is one which I think the Senate will enjoy:

Case No. 9. This individual, after investigation, was not given security clearance by the State Department. After failing to obtain clearance by the State Department he secured a job in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. And where do Senators think that man is today? He is now a speech writer in the White House. That is case No. 9. I will secure a little more information on that case if I may.

So that there may be no question about this, we will refer directly to the investigative file. I think I am doing Mr. Truman a favor by telling him this. I do not think he knows it. I do not think he would have this individual there writing speeches for him if he knew it.

Both the individual referred to and his wife—this is in the file of the investigative agency—are members of Communist-front organizations. He has a relative who has a financial interest in the Daily Worker. But in any event the State Department used good judgment not to clear this individual.

Case No. 10. This individual is in the Biographical Information Division of the State Department. Her husband signed a Communist Party election petition, stating he was a member thereof. She is active in the UPWA. The mere fact that her husband was a Communist may not make her a Communist, but she also has been given top secret clearance.

Case No. 11. This individual was an analyst in OSS from July 1943 to August 1945, and was employed in the Division of Map Intelligence in the State Department after August 1945. He is a close pal of a known Communist and has stated it would be a good idea if the Communists would take over in this country. He is a regular reader of the Daily Worker. This individual is not in the State Department at this time, but has a job in the CIA as of today. Here is what we find. Such individuals use the State Department as a stepping stone to some other agency. This man, who pals around with Communists, who is satisfied, according to the files of the State Department, that Communists should take over this country, is now in the Central Intelligence Agency.

Case No. 12. This individual started as a corresponding secretary at the White House. From there he moved over to the Soviet Embassy and obtained a job as assistant editor. From there he transferred to the State Department and, so far as I can discover, transferred from there to a section of the Commerce Department, with which the State Department works, where he remained until several months ago. Where he is as of today I frankly do not know. I think this is a rather interesting shift, however, from White House to the Soviet Embassy, to the State Department, to the Commerce Department.

Case No. 13. This individual is a foreign reserve officer under the information and cultural program. He was appointed to this position in September 1947, and assigned to Milan, Italy, where he took part in the educational program. This individual spent time in Soviet Russia in 1927 as a member of the trade-unions delegation to Soviet Russia, which delegation was repudiated by William Green, president of the A. F. of L. He was the sponsor, organizer, and member, respectively, of various Communist-front organizations. He has been cited by the Daily Worker a number of times for his work. The records of the industrial detail of the Chicago police department list him as a Communist as early as 1930. This man's file shows that members of the churches in Italy and high officials of the National Catholic Welfare Council objected to his being assigned to educational duties in Italy, basing this objection upon his communistic activities. Lt. Col. Gayre, of the British Army, who was this individual's supervisor in Italy, indicated that he was a "wild leftist theorist," who would veer entirely to the left if given the opportunity. This individual is described as a pedantic, tedious, conceited, impractical, pompous man, and this applies to so many of them, a man who would enjoy the pleasures of the right, but popularity with the left.

Case No. 14. This is a case of pressure from a high State Department official to obtain security clearance for an individual with a bad background from the standpoint of security. He was appointed in December 1945 as a translator in the State Department.

This is an interesting case showing the extent to which some of their superior officers will go when they find that some of these very unusual individuals are going to lose their jobs. He was appointed in December 1945 as a translator in the State Department. A report from another Government investigating agency under date of January 9, 1946, advised that the subject should be dismissed as a bad security risk because he was flagrantly homosexual. He had extremely close connections with other individuals with the same tendencies, and who were active members of Communist-front organizations, including the Young Communist League.

I think this is interesting, Mr. President. I asked one of our top intelligence men in Washington, one day, "Why do you find men who are so fanatically Communist? Is there something about the Communist philosophy that attracts them?"

He said, "Senator McCarthy, if you had been in this work as long as we have been, you would realize that there is something wrong with each one of these individuals. You will find that practically every active Communist is twisted mentally or physically in some way."

The State Department's own security agency recommended the discharge of this employee on January 22, 1946. On February 19, 1946, this individual's services were terminated with the State Department. Subsequently on April 1, 1946, the action discharging this individual was rescinded and he was reinstated in his job in the State Department. In this case a CSA report of September 2, 1947, is replete with information covering the attempt of a high State Department official to induce several individuals who had signed affidavits reflecting adversely upon the employee to repudiate their affidavits. The file shows that that high State Department employee even went out and personally contacted the individuals who signed the affidavits, and asked them, "Won't you repudiate them?"

This individual, according to the security files of the State Department, was a very close associate of active Soviet agents. As to whether he is in the State Department at this time or not, I frankly do not know, but in view of the fact that he was reinstated, I assume that he is.

A while ago the Senator from Nebraska asked whether I would yield while he suggested the absence of a quorum. I shall be glad to do so now. However, if

the Senator thinks it is not possible to obtain a quorum at this time——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me at this time, let me say to the majority leader that I do not wish to disrupt the program. I wish to cooperate with the majority leader in carrying on the session.

I said then, and I say now, that these charges are very serious. If there is a desire to have a quorum call now, I shall be glad to have one.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that I have just received a note that the majority leader—I am not criticizing him for doing so—has informed all Senators on his side of the aisle that there will not be a vote tonight, and that there is no reason for Senators to remain here, and that there will be no quorum call. I assume he did not do that because he did not want Senators on his side of the aisle to hear the charges. I assume he merely wanted to give them an opportunity to go to dinner. However, I have no desire to present what I regard as important information before a half-empty Senate.

On the other hand, if the majority leader thinks there is not a possibility of obtaining a quorum, because of the advice given to Senators on his side of the aisle, I shall be glad to yield for a motion to take a recess until tomorrow.

In other words, I do not agree to having the majority dismissed by the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I told Senators that there would not be a vote tonight upon the cotton bill which is the pending question. Had I known that there would have been any question about a quorum call, I certainly would have had Senators remain here, to be present to answer to a quorum call, if not to listen to the Senator's address.

We have now continued until 7:30 in the evening.

In view of the statement about having a night session and in view of the work that is before us, I had hoped that the Senator from Wisconsin would conclude his remarks tonight.

If he does not conclude his remarks tonight, but expects to resume them tomorrow, he certainly will not have any time then, because of the unanimous consent agreement which has been entered in regard to a vote at 3 o'clock on Senate bill 75.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me inquire of the majority leader whether the information I have received is correct. Did the Senator advise Senators on his side of the aisle that there was no reason for them to remain, that he would assure them there would be no quorum call and no vote?

Mr. LUCAS. I did not assure them that there would be no quorum call.

All that Senators on this side of the aisle asked me was whether there would be a vote tonight. I said, "No," that the Senator from Wisconsin was going to take the floor, and probably would occupy the floor for 4 or 5 hours, as I had been informed; and I said, "I will stay here, and I hope everyone else who wants to hear the Senator will stay here as he discusses this very important question." But so far as a vote was concerned, I advised all Senators who asked me, and I advised the minority leader so that he could advise Senators on his side of the aisle, that there would be no vote on the pending question tonight.

But I certainly hope the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed, because he is making a very important address, and the country is interested in it, and what few Senators are here now are interested in it; and I doubt whether there will be more Senators here day after tomorrow than are present now.

At this time I see another Senator returning to the Chamber after having had his dinner. I know he is very much interested in the question the Senator from Wisconsin is discussing. The Senator from Oregon has just reentered the Chamber, and I know he is trying to swell the attendance of Senators here a little.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is also reentering the Chamber now, I observe.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield once again, 10 or 12 Senators are in the Chamber at this time, several on the other side, and some on this side, who are staying here to be helpful to the Senator from Wisconsin. But I appeal to the Senator in regard to what I regard as the only logical thing to do. I do not wish to be in the position of forcing the majority leader to call a quorum.

I do know that the majority leader has told Members on both sides of the aisle, in my presence, that there would not be a vote tonight on the pending question. He did so with good intentions, namely, to state that there would not be a vote tonight on the potato issue.

But he knows, as I do, that when such statements are made, attendance in the Senate Chamber decreases, and it is very difficult to proceed with a night session under such circumstances.

I do not feel in a position to instruct the majority leader, in view of the other announcement.

However, we are to have a vote tomorrow at 4 o'clock; and after that, of course, we can take up anything that it is desired to take up.

This is an important matter, and there might be a demand to learn all the facts.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin is presenting a serious challenge, and I think it desirable to have all Senators present, if possible, to hear his remarks.

I do not insist upon having a quorum call. I doubt very much whether we could obtain a quorum, and I do not want to take advantage of the parliamentary situation. But I say, in all fairness, that as soon as the Senator reaches a point where he can conveniently suspend his remarks until tomorrow——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I shall not be as careful of the majority leader's feelings as the minority leader is. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, unless the Senator wishes to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

I think it is very unusual, in view of the Senator's declaration of his interest in this subject, for the majority leader to dismiss Senators on his side of the aisle or encourage them to leave the Chamber.

I think the subject now under discussion is one in which the Democrats should be especially interested. As the Senator from Illinois knows, unless something is done to clean up the State Department, the Democratic Party is going to be identified with that group. I think that is wrong. I think there are too many fine Democrats in this country and too many fine Democrats in the Senate, on the Democratic side of the aisle, to permit the Democratic Party to be identified with the group I have been discussing. I think Democratic Senators should be as much interested as we on this side of the aisle are in cleaning up that situation.

But I do not like the information I have received, namely, that the Senator from Illinois has advised all Senators on his side of the aisle to leave. If the information I have received is not correct, I should like to know it.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It is customary here, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, that when Members of the Senate inquire whether there is to be a vote on the pending question at a certain time, if it is known that there is not to be a vote at that time, the reply is "No." Of course, immediately such Senators leave, as the Senator knows; and no doubt the Senator from Wisconsin himself has done that many times since he has been a Member of the Senate. Whenever the minority leader tells Senators on his side of the aisle that there is not going to be a vote on the pending question, they do not usually remain to hear the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin or the speech of the Senator from Illinois on any subject, regardless of how important it may be.

The Senator from Wisconsin should not think he has any monopoly on fighting communism in this country, and he cannot by implication or by innuendo attack the Senator from Illinois with respect to cleaning out the State Department. I have told the Senator before, and I repeat it now, that whenever the Senator names names and presents conclusive information before the proper committees, or if he will do it now before the Senate, if he desires, and if what he says is substantiated, I will go arm in arm with my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin in assisting in cleaning out any Communist nests in the State Department or in any other branch of the Government.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows me well enough to know that I was fighting communism long before the Senator from Wisconsin was, because I am several years older than he is. But the matter is so important that it seems to me we should have this entire story now. Let us get all the information and all the facts in the RECORD at this particular time; and the Senator can, by unanimous consent, offer and introduce into the RECORD anything he wishes to. Let him put all of it in, and then ask for a meeting, either before a special committee of some kind or before the Foreign Rela-

tions Committee or the Judiciary Committee, and go thoroughly into the things the Senator is talking about.

I am all for that, I say to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator agree with me that in view of the facts that I have presented, it is absolutely necessary that we have a complete and thorough investigation of this matter by a Senate committee?

Mr. LUCAS. I am in favor of a complete and thorough investigation of what the Senator has said; and I hope the Foreign Relations Committee or some other committee will bring the Senator immediately before it and will interrogate him under oath with respect to what he has presented here. The Senator should name names before that committee, because he has said——

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator yielded to me.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I will get a quorum, if that is the case.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator feels that he will embarrass Senators on his side of the aisle by calling a quorum, I will yield while he moves that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Let me say this, Mr. President, in view of the attitude of the Senator from Illinois, who last week, before he knew any of the evidence, went to Chicago, where he said, "Senator McCARTHY is lying; there is not a single Communist in the State Department."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I——

Mr. McCARTHY. Wait a minute, let me finish. He said there was not a word of truth in what I said. He said if he had said what I said about there being 57 Communists in the State Department, he would be ashamed the rest of his life. He now seems to think this should be made a trial of the man who is digging out the Communists, instead of the Communists. If we are to indulge in such tactics I want the entire Senate present to hear it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will move to recess until tomorrow, if the Senate wishes that to be done.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. So far as the junior Senator from Idaho is concerned, he has been glad to remain on the floor to listen to these important revelations of the Senator from Wisconsin, because the Senator from Wisconsin, in his remarks, has shed some light upon the possible reasons for the State Department's foreign policy in China during the past few years, which possibly justified the infiltration of communism within China, to such an extent that it may now be too late to present this very vital information to one of the committees of the Senate. It is too late now to counteract and nullify that insidious State Department influence, through scores and scores of Communists and fellow travelers who have been responsible, even under Secretaries of State like General Marshall. We realize that only recently J. Edgar Hoover made the public statement that in this country today there are 540,000 Communists and fellow travelers. So I think, the American people are entitled to have a complete exposure of the forces within the State Department. If there is no truth or justification in what the junior Senator from Wisconsin has been telling this body this evening, then the American people should know the truth. But at a time when every American recognizes that we are at the mercy of sabotaging by those who have been placed on high levels in the State Department and other branches of the executive department, it behooves us not only to spend $13,000,000,000 or $14,000,000,000 annually on the national defense, but it is the duty, the obligation—I believe the American people join with me in making the statement that it is the obligation—of the President of the United States, who is alone responsible for the selection of these officials, through the Secretary of State, to make a housecleaning, so that we may proceed to build up the security and defenses of the country, to the end that we may be prepared, in case we should be the victims of Communist aggression in the months ahead.

I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Wisconsin on the revelations he is making at this time. Notwithstanding the fact that there are entirely too few Members of this body present, it is encouraging to note that so many members of the press and radio galleries are present. I believe they recognize that the American people want the facts, though, even now, it may be too late to clean our house of the rats and saboteurs who are a constant menace to the safety of the Republic.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have decided it may be well to complete the presentation of the case tonight, but I am not going to speak to an empty chamber. I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum, and then proceed to develop all the facts. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	McClellan
Anderson	Hendrickson	McFarland
Butler	Ives	Murray
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Darby	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lucas	Wherry
Ecton	McCarthy	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators: and Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, much as I dislike to do this, I presume that I shall be compelled to make a motion to adjourn. I have not made it yet——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that debate is not in order.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not debate; I shall only make a statement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, unless I can make a statement also, I shall call for the regular order. If the Senator from Illinois is going to make a statement, I want an opportunity to answer him.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. LANGER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. LONG, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. KILGORE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I find from reading the newspapers that the wet season is driving the pintails north.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, what is the result?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, what is the result of the vote?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, how am I recorded as voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. CORDON. I vote "nay."

Mr. IVES. What is the result, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk is still tallying.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. JOHNSON] the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Rhode

Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—16

Fulbright	Kilgore	Murray
Hayden	Lehman	Robertson
Hoey	Long	Russell
Holland	Lucas	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	McClellan	
Kerr	McFarland	

NAYS—18

Aiken	Dworshak	Morse
Cain	Ecton	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Ives	Taft
Darby	Langer	Wherry
Donnell	McCarthy	Williams

NOT VOTING—62

Anderson	Gurney	Mundt
Benton	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bridges	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kefauver	Stennis
Connally	Kem	Taylor
Douglas	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McKellar	Tydings
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
George	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Withers
Graham	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to adjourn is rejected.

Mr. TAFT. A point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. If there is not a quorum present the vote is obviously invalid.

Mr. LUCAS. Not on this motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair state that no quorum is needed on a motion to adjourn.

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a further delay, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. ELLENDER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Later, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. WITHERS also entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there unanimous consent given to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to occupy the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no unanimous consent granted.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, Mr. President, I demand recognition.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Do I not have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that so long as a point of order is not made against the Senator from Wisconsin, he would be entitled to the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I make the point of order, Mr. President, and I ask for recognition.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Is it not too late to make the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will withdraw the point of order if the Senator from Wisconsin wants the floor.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I should be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall speak on my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been withdrawn. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, for the benefit of those Members of the Senate who were not present earlier in the evening, I have given detailed records of certain individuals in the State Department who have very definite communistic connections. I explained to the Senate earlier in the evening that I would not take the time to make out a court case against each person referred to. I am pointing out facts so that there may be a convening of one of the appropriate committees to make a thorough investigation.

As I explained earlier, there is a serious question whether I should disclose names to the Senate. I frankly feel, in view of the number of cases—there are 81 cases—that it would be a mistake to publicly disclose the names on the floor. I shall be willing, happy, and eager to go before any committee and give the names and all the information available. I shall refuse to give the source of the information, however. I know the State Department is very eager to know how I have secured all this information. I know that the jobs of the men who helped me secure this material would be worth nothing if the names were given. If it were not for some good, loyal Americans in the State Department—and there are many of them—I should not have been able to present this picture to the Senate tonight. The vast majority of the employees of the State Department are loyal, and I think the President should see to it that their good names are not tarnished.

I told the Senate earlier this evening that I have what I call the Big Three, No. 1, No. 2, and No. 81. I feel that if those individuals are removed from the State Department we shall have gone a considerable distance in breaking the back of the espionage ring in the State Department.

I also told the Senate earlier that I have no way of knowing definitely which of these persons are still in the employ of the State Department. I know they have all been there at some time. A sizable number is still there.

Case No. 16. This individual's file is perhaps the largest, physically, of the files in the CSA. Among other things, the file reflects that this individual furnished material to known Soviet espionage agents and that he had constant contacts with a long list of Communists and suspected Soviet agents. On July 24, 1946, a recommendation of dismissal was made. Nothing was done. In September 1946 there was a request for further information, even though at that time the records showed that he was furnishing secret material to known Communist agents.

On July 24, the State Department's own security unit furnished detailed evidence showing that this man was furnishing secret material to known espionage agents. He had top-secret clearance.

In September further information was requested. As of October 15, 1947, nearly a year and a quarter later, there was nothing in the file to indicate whether the individual was with the Department or what the final action was in his case. I later learned that 6 months after the original recommendation of dismissal was made, he finally resigned. He was not discharged. He resigned on December 13, 1947. For what Federal agency he is working at this time, I frankly do not know. I have attempted to get that information from the Civil Service Commission. It has been very helpful, but there are so many individuals of the same name that the Commission has had difficulty in furnishing the information.

Case No. 17. This individual signed an affidavit saying that he was a member of the Communist Party. He did this on several occasions. This was not a non-Communist affidavit; it was a Communist affidavit. This file is rather significant, in that the reviewing officer in this case indicated that if this employee had testified to a change of heart, he would have received top-secret clearance. In other words, if this man had said, "I have now reformed," the security officer felt he was bound to give him top-secret clearance. This, of course, seems unusual to us, but a Communist, who has, of course, no respect for the oath, which consists of swearing before the Creator that he will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, is educated to the idea that there is no Supreme Being, so, obviously, an oath means nothing to him. I think the reviewing authority in the State Department should bear that fact in mind.

Case No. 18. This individual was thoroughly investigated before being hired on December 26, 1946. While the file indicates that this woman was a Communist, I am not too sure that she was not a psychopathic case. She was hired when the file showed a great deal of Communist activity on her part.

Case No. 19. This file is rather a lengthy one. It shows many Communist Party connections. The individual is working for the Government today. I have been able to secure that much information. Whether he is in the State Department I frankly do not know.

Case No. 20. This individual's file shows close connections with a number of Communist-front organizations. The individual, his sister, and his father spent some time in mental institutions. The report, which is dated July 7, 1947, shows that his mental health is unstable. This man is still in the Department as of today.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator have any information as to the type of responsibility the last-named individual has in the State Department? In other words, does he do janitorial work, or supervisory work, or just what kind of work does he do?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know. The information was not in the file. I was curious about that particular question myself. I was told that he had top-secret clearance. That would indicate that he was handling rather important documents. Frankly, what he was doing, I do not know. Let me check on the actual case, if I may, so that we may have any information on it that may be available. He is in the Office of Information and Educational Exchange. What he is doing there, I do not know.

Cases Nos. 21 to 26 are rather typical of many of the employees in the New York office of OIE. That is the Voice of America broadcast. The picture in the seven cases is substantially the same. First, the character reference is from another known Communist. In other words, the file shows, in effect, that it is a case of "You recommend me; I'll recommend you." So it is a case of Commies, or persons with Communist connections, recommending each other. There is nothing in the file which indicates the employees' activities beyond a period several years prior to the employment.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator mean that he does not know what the activities are of these persons in the Department of State, or that he does not know their prior activities?

Mr. McCARTHY. I know that their activities in the Department were with the Voice of America in the New York branch.

Mr. DONNELL. I mean, in what type of work are they engaged?

Mr. McCARTHY. As to this particular case, I do not know. I shall come to one, case No. 81, but let me read that now for the benefit of the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. I was wondering whether the Senator would permit me to ask another question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough, if he thinks it advisable, to give us from time to time, as he goes through the cases, information as to the type of work or the type of responsibility with which the individual is charged?

Mr. McCARTHY. I can say to the Senator that it would be extremely difficult to do that, because all the records are completely secret except what I could get from loyal State Department employees. I can tell in a great number of cases what particular branch the individuals are working in, whether in Research and Intelligence, or in other activities. Incidentally, Research and Intelligence is a favorite office for fellow travelers to get into. A short time ago I cited the case of one individual who succeeded in going from Research and Intelligence to CIA. He is with CIA today.

One of the principal cases is case No. 81. It deals with one of the top officials in OIE, the Voice of America, and I shall reach that shortly. Referring again to the previous case, the individual is still either working in this branch of the State Department, or has succeeded in transferring to some other agency having to do with information. All these individuals try to get into some branch having to do with information or research.

Case No. 28. This individual has been with the State Department as a Foreign Service career officer since 1936. He is still holding a high salaried job with the Government, and to the best of my knowledge he is now stationed at Frankfurt, Germany. A report of June 23, 1947, indicates that he is a member of the Communist Party, that he attended the Youth International in Russia in 1935. While working in the State Department, the file indicates, he showed an intense interest in getting information on anything pertaining to Russia, including any figures and records, whether or not the information had any connection with his particular job. He had been discharged previously from the AFL Federation of Government Employees, on the charge of communistic activity. Both he and his wife have been members of a number of Communist-front organizations, and he has been very closely associated with known Communist-front workers. The file discloses the interesting information that he is a member of the central group, whose task it is to spearhead an attack on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. These fellows do not like J. Edgar Hoover at all. The man is a member of the central group which is the spearhead of such an attack. This is all in his file. He is still working for the Government.

Case No. 29. This individual, according to the State Department's own Security Division, is a known Communist member. A file dated April 13, 1947, shows that he is a member of an underground Communist group in Washington, D. C. Both he and his wife have been in close touch with a functionary of the Soviet espionage ring in Washington, D. C. I want to be sure about this. He is still working in Government work. Whether he is in the State Department or not I have not been able to find out, but I know he was in the State Department not too long ago, and he is still in the Government service. Let me repeat that for the benefit of the Senate. The intelligence agency's file shows that this man is a known Communist Party member, and another file, dated April 13, 1947, shows that he is a member of an underground Communist group in Washington, D. C. Both he and his wife have been in close touch with a functionary of the Soviet espionage ring in Washington. His brother, who either was or is in the State Department, was a member of the Jackson Heights, Long Island, N. Y., branch of the Communist Party. There was considerable additional material in the file of this individual which I cannot give to the Senate this time, because it is all tied up with the source of the information. The file indicates that this man is not only very active as a Communist, but is a very dangerous Communist.

Case No. 30. This man was a production supervisor of motion pictures for the OIE; that is, the Voice of America. He also had previously signed an affidavit to the effect that he was a member of the Communist Party. That is pretty

much the picture of all that OIE crowd in New York.

I might say that there has been some cleaning out. As we get down to case 81, Senators will see that one of the top people was temporarily transferred, and while away something else happened, and there are some good loyal people in the office in New York. Otherwise, I would not be able to get the information I am giving the Senate.

Case No. 31. This individual has been in Government service since July 1942. He was stationed in the Office of Information and Education of the State Department. The information was not in the file, but the hearings before the Un-American Activities Committee showed that he had signed a petition in New York in 1940 to the effect that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Case No. 32. This individual has been with the Government since July 1942. He was stationed in the Office of Education and Information in the State Department. It will be noted as I go through that the highest percentage of these individuals were stationed in some information branch of the Government. According to the Un-American Activities Committee, he had signed a petition in 1940 to the effect that he was a member of the Communist Party. The State Department took no action whatsoever upon this case, and so far as I know, the investigative unit there conducted no further investigation as to him, unless it was fairly recently.

Case No. 33. This man has been in the Government service since July 1942. The picture is pretty much the same as in the last case, except that he is in a high-salaried position at the present time in the Office of Information and Education. This man, I know definitely, is in the Office of Information and Education of the State Department. He signed an affidavit in 1940 that he was a member of the Communist Party. He has been in the Government service since 1942. Apparently no check was made on him as to his other Communist activities, and I have no further information about him.

Case No. 34. This individual was born in Russia in 1896, and became a naturalized United States citizen in 1938. From July 1934 to April 1940 he worked for Amtorg Trading Corporation. The Senate will recall that that is the corporation that was visited by the FBI shortly after the last session ended, and they picked up five or six of the Amtorg officials in connection with espionage activities. This man worked for that corporation until 1940. He worked with the Maritime Union from June to August 1941, was with the OWI from February 1945 to February 1946, then was transferred to the State Department. His file shows that he has very close connection with the Communist espionage agents. As to this man, I frankly do not know whether he is still in the State Department or not. He went with the State Department some time after February 1946.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred, a moment ago, I think just before the last case, to one individual as being a high-salaried employee. Does the Senator have information as to what the man's salary is?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not. I think he was a CAF, class 9 or 10. He was up in the $7,000 or $8,000 bracket. I did not pay too much attention to that. He was in a fairly high-salaried position. I could get the information for the Senator, I think. In looking over the papers I have I do not find information as to the salary he receives.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

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

Mr. MUNDT. I notice in several of the cases the Senator has mentioned it was not clear whether or not the officials mentioned were still employed by the State Department. The State Department issued a news release last week in which Mr. Peurifoy stated that 202 Communists and security risks have been dismissed from the State Department since 1946.

I wondered if the Senator has asked the State Department to let him see that list of those who may have been dismissed because of disloyalty reasons, which would greatly simplify the Senator's task in determining whether they are still there? Inasmuch as so much has been said about making information available, it would seem to me to be proper to make a direct request of the Department for a list of those whom the Department has dismissed for disloyalty reasons, to which the Department could not very well make any other than an affirmative reply.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from South Dakota know whether Mr. Peurifoy said that they were dismissed for disloyalty reasons, or dismissed and allowed to resign?

Mr. MUNDT. I think Mr. Peurifoy's statement said that their relationships with the State Department were severed because of security reasons. I think frequently they are permitted to resign after they have been singled out and their attention has been called to the fact that the State Department has caught up with their disloyalty records, but whether they have been permitted to resign or whether they have been severed, since he has given us the definite figure of 202, there would be an ideal check list for the Senator from Wisconsin to use in finding out whether these persons are still with the Department of State.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator, but I think it makes a difference whether they have resigned or are discharged and obtained employment in other departments of the Government.

Mr. MUNDT. One of the great difficulties we confront in trying to get Communists out of Government is that apparently once they have been removed from one department there is no alert given to the other departments so they simply drift from one department to another. So if there were some such list made available to all the employment chiefs, then, assuming that the employment chiefs do not want to hire Communists, they could use that list as a screen.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with foreign affairs, I may say it was indicated that these persons in the majority of cases were permitted to resign rather than to be discharged.

Mr. MUNDT. They were permitted to resign after, I believe, they had been told that the State Department had made an examination of their loyalty status and found it questionable.

Mr. McCARTHY. And permitted to resign so they would find it easier to secure another job.

Mr. MUNDT. Perfectly true.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say in that connection, Mr. President, that the whole picture seems to be—and you recall I cited some cases along that line—that where they can get one top man in an important position, that then very shortly we see them dragging in their fellow Communists. When that is done we may be sure they will not be discharged for Communist activities. They are allowed to resign so they can be taken over by another department. The disturbing thing is that they are resigning from the State Department and then going into the other branches which, while not technically under the State Department, are to all intents and purposes under the State Department. When they are allowed to resign it does not give them a bad record and they can move into another position.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator is putting his finger on a very important deficiency in the President's so-called security program, because if a Communist is found to be guilty in the eyes of the State Department or any other department of Government and then permitted to resign so as to secure employment in some other department of Government or in some other bureau, or a place in private employment, the general public has had a fraud launched against it, and it is the policy of giving the benefit of the doubt to the Communists instead of the benefit of the doubt to the Government. Certainly when we come to the place where we have discovered a Communist I see no reason why all the departments of Government should not be alerted, and for that reason, when the evidence is complete, the general public might well be alerted so the individual cannot sneak his way into some college faculty, some farmers' organization, some labor organization, or some women's club. Once the security check has pointed out that here is a man attempting to sabotage freedom in this country and trying to sell us out to a foreign tyranny, Government departments are notoriously weak, in my opinion, if they fail then to alert the general public to that fact.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is an excellent idea. I may say that merely alerting the new potential boss sometimes does not do too much good. The Senator was not present when I recited a very unusual case, the case of a man who is now one of our foreign ministers. The case was that of a man who is one of our ministers. His file suddenly disappeared, that is, the vast majority of it. An attempt was made to find out where the file went. The keeper of the file, if one can call him that, said it went to one of the top brass, and it is in his safe, and has been there for 2 years. However, he did not obtain all the material. Some of the remaining material shows that certain secret material was prepared for transmission to a foreign government. The material was prepared for a foreign government. It showed up in Moscow before it even left Washington. Does the Senator follow me? Of course, the Security Agency was very much concerned with that. They apparently had suspicions ahead of time. Their report—and their report of this matter is all in the file, the Senator understands, was to the effect that this man who is now one of our ministers, was shadowed by the Security Agency; their men physically saw him make contact with a known espionage agent. The agent was shadowed to the Soviet Embassy, and that is where the material disappeared, and then showed up in Moscow. When this man's superior officer cleans out his files, I am very curious what that man's file contains.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I left the Senate Chamber at 7:30 p. m. What number of case is the Senator now on?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am now on case No. 34.

Mr. McMAHON. In the cases the Senator has recited, has the Senator simply read the derogatory information that was in the files or has the Senator attempted to give the full contents of the file in each case?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that I am only giving the Senate cases in which it appears clear that there is a definite Communist connection. If there is evidence in the file to show that a man was not a Communist, frankly, those files have not come to my attention.

I am not sure that I get the Senator's thought fully. This man may have been good to his wife and children and all that sort of thing. What I am interested in is: Does the file confirm what we felt we knew about him? In other words, does the investigative agency's file show that this man was in contact with Communists? Did he belong to Communist-front organizations? Did he belong to a Communist organization? Was he a foreign agent?

I assure the Senator that this is not a game. I am trying to give the Senate as clear a picture as I can. I do not give the Senate anything that would indicate the source of the information.

As I said earlier this evening, I think it is impossible and very unwise for us to pass any legislation providing that we could subpena, for example, the files of the FBI. I think if we did that we would set the FBI back 10, 20, or 30 years. The only way we can safely use these files is with complete cooperation and understanding. So, for example, when the FBI has cleared the staff of the Senator's committee, they can work with the Senator's committee and give the committee the benefit of its investigation.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I am glad to.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator understands that what I am trying to find out is whether the Senator has in his possession the complete file that is in the State Department, either the original file—I take it the Senator does not have that—or a copy of it. Has the Senator both the derogatory information and any good information that is in that file?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator asks whether I have complete State Department files. The answer is "No."

Mr. McMAHON. Has the Senator the complete files in any one of the 34 cases?

Mr. McCARTHY. Eighty-one cases.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator said he had presented 34 cases so far.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I take it the Senator is going through all 81. I merely say that when the Senator reaches case No. 81 I hope to be home in bed. That is beside the point. I want to find out from the Senator if in the cases he has read or in the cases that are to be presented, the Senator is able to give the Senate both the derogatory information that is in the file and any contradictory information that indicates that the derogatory information may be in question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. That is a yes-or-no question. Would the Senator give this information if he had it in his possession?

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator want the answer?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. The answer is that I obviously do not have photostats of all the files.

Mr. McMAHON. Has the Senator got——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. I do not have a counterespionage group of my own. All I can do is pick up the information, check, and make sure it is confirmed by something in the State Department file. The Senator understands I do not have complete State Department files in these matters. I very greatly wish I did. That is one of the things I hope one of our committees will succeed in getting.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. In a moment, if I may. If we are going to have a staff to work on these files the FBI should clear the members of that staff first to make sure that we do not have Communists among its members. When that is done, I hope the State Department will cooperate fully, and will say, "Here are the files. Take a look at them."

I do not have that now.

Mr. McMAHON. At last, that is the answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator does not have in his possession any information which will indicate that that derogatory statement is true. Does not the Senator realize that if I were to send investigators into his State, perhaps I could obtain 105 or perhaps 1,005 witnesses who would make statements about the Senator that would be totally untrue and incorrect, and the same investigators might go to 2,000 other persons who would say, "Those 105 people are not telling the truth at all. They are very angry with the Senator because he voted for this bill or that bill that they did not like."

Did the Senator ever think of that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut had been in the Senate Chamber earlier this evening, he would have heard that question answered.

The Senator from Illinois demanded, loudly, that I furnish all the names. I told him at that time that so far as I was concerned, I thought that would be improper; that I did not have all the information about these individuals. I have enough to convince me that either they are members of the Communist Party or they are giving great aid to the Communists. I may be wrong. That is why I said that unless the Senate demanded that I do so, I would not submit this publicly, but I would submit it to any committee—the Senator's committee or any other Senate committee—and would let the committee go over these in executive session. It is possible that some of these persons will get a clean bill of health. I know that some of them will not.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has made my point for me, however, namely, that in the files that he has, there is only derogatory information.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. McMAHON. And that he is not able——

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. McMAHON. That he is not able to give to the Senate the information which contradicts the derogatory information.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not true.

Mr. McMAHON. Because if the Senator has it and if he is not giving it to the Senate at this time, it would appear to me that he is trying to present a one-sided picture.

I say to the Senator that there is no desire on my part to prejudge a single one of these cases. I do not need to tell the Senator that I am as much opposed to communism in the State Department or in any other Department as he is.

But I tell the Senator that in the course of my career I have examined many Government files and many investigation records, and I have seen in the files statements that, "This man McCarthy" or "This man——

Mr. McCARTHY. Make it "Jones."

Mr. McMAHON. Or "This man Smith is a terrible person. He is not to be trusted. He defrauds his creditors. He even beats his wife. He has been seen going around the corner with suspicious-looking persons."

And then if we go to other persons in the community, they say, "I am not at all surprised that you have been told that, because Smith had a fight with a man named Jones, who lives down the street. I will bet that you got an interview with him, and that in it he said that this fellow Smith is a terrible man."

I call attention to the possibility that if we had the whole file before us, as undoubtedly the State Department has, the information the Senator from Wisconsin is giving the Senate might be contradicted to the point where creditable witnesses or creditable evaluators of the files would say, "In that event, we cannot believe that information."

I do not say to the Senator that that is so; I merely point out the possibility of its being so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I have a fairly good digest of the files. However, in such a case as this, I think we must give the American people the benefit of the doubt. Instead of there being 57 Communists in the State Department, let us say that there are only one or two. If there were one or two Communists who were serving as top officials in our State Department, that alone would be fully sufficient to keep the opposition informed about the operations of the Department.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish my statement, please.

I have said to the Senator that I am not indicting the 81. I have said there is sufficient in the files to show that there is something radically wrong. If the Senator will remain here and will listen to some more of the cases, I am sure he will be convinced. After all, he came to the floor after I had been speaking for some time.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator advise the Members of the Senate now present whether he is presenting to the Senate a series of personal opinions about the persons or whether he is presenting matters of record?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not presenting anything except what is confirmed by the files of the individual concerned. In other words, in one case the intelligence department said, "Get rid of this man. Six professors, some at the University of California and some at Harvard, say this fellow is a fellow-traveler, a Communist, a close friend of Friedman, secretary of the Communists in California, and a close friend of Harry Bridges."

But the "top brass" in the State Department say, "No, because he has not committed any overt act."

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I certainly would not judge the case upon the basis of what the Senator has just said. I certainly think—and I think it is the American system——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think it is the American system that when a man is accused, he shall be given a hearing, that all witnesses for him and against him shall be heard and adjudged; and then, upon that judgment and upon that evidence, does not the Senator think the judgment should be rendered?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say to the Senator——

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator, if I may continue my question——

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that what we have to be careful of is that we do not imitate the very thing we are against. Star chambers are not for the United States of America, nor are trials ex parte, on the basis of part of the files of the persons concerned, on the floor of the United States Senate, the way to handle this matter.

That is my question.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator from Maine to permit me to answer the Senator from Connecticut first.

If the Senator from Connecticut had been here a little earlier, he would have heard the majority leader demanding that we do exactly that. He demanded that I present the names and indict these people before the country, without giving them a chance to be heard.

I said, "No, I will not do that unless the Senate demands it." I said, "I have the information. I want to present it to any Senate committee, and have the committee decide about it."

This information is nothing new. It has been there a long time. If the Senator or anyone else who is interested had expended sufficient effort, he could have brought this to the attention of the Senate.

I do not fancy at all this condemnation of an attempt to bring this matter before the Senate. I intend to give all the facts. From the information which I have before me, I agree with the intelligence agencies which have said, "These men should not be in the State Department." I agree with the intelligence agencies who said, "Do not give these men top-secret clearance."

I may be wrong. That is why I am not naming them. But I think that soon—tomorrow—the proper Senate committee that is actually interested, not in investigating people who may be Communists, but in investigating as to whether or not the State Department is overrun with Communists, should examine into these matters.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is not the essence of star-chamber proceedings that the public are not permitted to know the facts? Is not the essence of the kind of government which we here are fighting the kind of executive government which refuses to permit the legislative authority to know the truth?

After the revelations in the Hiss and the Fuchs and some other cases would it not seem that the Congress should be permitted to exercise its historical authority, never denied until recent years; and does it not seem strange that the Executive would refuse to permit those in the Senate and in the House of Representatives the right to know what is going on in Washington?

I do not see how any defenders of democracy, in view of the Hiss and the Fuchs cases, can still maintain the right of the executive department of government to refuse—as has been occurring repeatedly in recent years—information from the files to be authorized to be seen by the committees of Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may point out to the Senator that the Constitution gives the Congress the right to get the information which we have been demanding for some time. Under the Constitution, of course, the Congress has a right to that information. How we can force the President to give the information to Congress I do not know.

On August 4, 1948, the day Hiss was exposed by the House committee, and the day of the President's famous "red herring" statement, the President signed an order saying, "No more departmental information shall be given to congressional committees."

At that time there might have been a reason for it; at that time the Congress was controlled by the Republican Party, and I can see why the President, with an election coming along, might have felt that the information might have been used for some political gain.

However, the President's party has had control of both the Senate and the House of Representatives for over a year now, and it seems that the President should be able to trust his own party. His party is in control. He should be able to say, "This is information to which the Congress is entitled, under the Constitution. My own party is in power. I will let them have it."

Frankly, Mr. President, I think the President is making a terrible mistake. If I may suggest something to the Senator, let me say that I think he and I certainly should be on the same side in this matter. The Democratic Party certainly is going to suffer because of this, but it should not. I think the Democratic Party has lost control of the executive branch. An unusual group of people—a group of twisted-thinking intellectuals—has taken over in the State Department, in recent years. They think they are right, that is what makes them dangerous.

If the Democratic Party, as we see it represented here in the Senate, had control, I do not think this sorry situation would exist.

So the Senator should work with us in trying to clean house.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator's observation is entirely beside the point, as was the observation just made by the Senator from Maine. I do not stand here to defend anyone. I simply wish to point out to the Senator that there was

a complete file on these persons, and the Senator obviously was giving only the derogatory information.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I pointed out to the Senator that fairness demanded that the full files be made available, and certainly that should be done before judgment of the case is had. That is my position, and nothing else.

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CAPEHART, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield in a moment.

First, Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Connecticut just indulged in an erroneous assumption when he said I was indicating only the derogatory information. This is a résumé of the file.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope the Senator will not follow the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut and discontinue his effort to purge Communists from the Government.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut made no such statement.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator should wait until I finish.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. A Senator who has the floor can yield only for a question. Senators who wish to ask questions must first be yielded to for that purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I first make it clear that I will yield to every Senator present, as often as he wants me to yield, but for the present I am yielding to the Senator from South Dakota, and I will yield to no one else until he has finished his question. I shall be glad then to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MUNDT. I want the Senator from Connecticut to listen to this statement. I think I am quoting him exactly. I think he suggested that the Senator from Wisconsin should not continue with this effort of his, until the full files are made available to him. Is not that correct? Was not that the Senator's statement?

Mr. McMAHON. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I thought it was correct.

Mr. McMAHON. It is.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will not yield to that kind of argument, because, had the argument of the Senator from Connecticut been followed, Alger Hiss would never have been convicted, for Alger Hiss was convicted after the President gave his freeze order denying us the right to see the full file. That would be a complete way to cover up every Communist in the Government.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer first, and then I will yield. I say to Senators, let them take their time. I will yield to everyone here, and all night if necessary. I want to say I definitely will not follow the suggestion offered by the Senator from Connecticut that I do nothing until I have the complete file of the case. The President said, "You shall not see the file." In fact, I never know when I have the complete file. I have information from the State Department files, information to which we are entitled. I am giving it to the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut has said something about my convicting someone. Although even the leader of the Senator's party has said, "You must give us the names," I have refused to do so. I have said, "I will give it to any committee. I will go before any committee. I will be sworn. I will do anything." I want to get some action, and I may say to the Senator, I think he is the type of man who should be working along with me on this matter. I have a great deal of respect for the Senator from Connecticut.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I am not trying to work against the Senator. What did I point out to the Senator and to the Senate? I pointed out that the Senator apparently has been giving the derogatory information contained in files of which he has secured possession. I further pointed out that in those files, if there was information which disproved the derogatory information, it was the duty of the Senator to present it to the Senate. Certainly no investigation of these persons could be consistent with American methods unless there were an evaluation both of the derogatory information and the information which went to disprove it. If we adopt any other theory than that, I claim we abandon one of the fundamental guaranties which underly our form of government. And if we are going to take the attitude that simply because someone says so-and-so is a Communist, or was seen talking to a Communist, it therefore, ipso facto, settles the matter, then I say we have adopted a theory which I do not understand to be in consonance with our form of government.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. I want to further point out to the Senator that, in fairness——

Mr. McCARTHY. Is this a question?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has listened to speeches from some of his other colleagues. I am sure he will indulge me in this observation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Go ahead.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. If he wants to be fair, and has full and complete files on a man, he ought to read not only the derogatory information but anything else that is said. After it is read I might agree, especially if I could hear the witnesses, with the Senator's contention that a certain individual ought to be kicked out of the Government and perhaps be put in jail. What I do not see is how anyone can form an intelligent judgment simply by reading what a half dozen people say, because perhaps they are rogues, scoundrels, and thieves. Perhaps they have some ulterior motive in making the statements they do. I do not know. I do not judge this case and say the Senator is not right, that the Senator does not have derogatory information, which, if true, would warrant the full penalty of the law. He may be entirely right about it. What I am pointing out is that there may be other facts which we ought to hear in connection with those cases. That is my point.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator flatters me when he says it is my duty to present the entire file to the Senate and to give the Senate all the information. The President has said we shall not get that file, and, as of the present moment, we are not on a "Dear Joe, Dear Harry" basis. I cannot go to the White House and say, "Harry, give me this file, because Senator McMAHON insists that you give me the information." All I can do is to give Senators what I can dig up. I have given Senators the fullest, most complete, fairest résumé of the files that I possibly could.

For the Senator to speculate that I have other information which I will not give him, is, I think, completely unfair. I have already asked for the complete files. I sent the President a telegram. I said, "Mr. President, here are 57 names. You may have them. But, in fairness to the Senate and the country, let us get the information on these people."

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me yield to the Senator from Maine, first.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the issue not as to who is to do the evaluating of which the Senator from Connecticut speaks? Is it to be done by the executive agencies that demonstrate in every way a determination to refuse what has always been considered the constitutional right of the legislative body to find out, or is the evaluation to be made in the historic method, by a duly authorized committee of the Senate? I do not understand that the Senator from Connecticut is denying the right of a senatorial group, nor do I understand him to be admitting it. I am very much interested to know whether he agrees with the executive viewpoint, asserted for the first time, so far as I know, in any substantial way in very recent years, that the executive would not give to committees of the Congress the right to look at files.

The first case I knew of was when, during the war, President Roosevelt refused Senator Truman, then chairman of the Truman committee, the right to examine the so-called Stettinius report. The first action which I took as chairman of the committee afterward was to ask President Truman for it, and he turned that report over, which conclusively demonstrated that we had been very much misled during the course of the war as to the mobilization, and the records thereof, demonstrating that Senator Truman was right in demanding the records, and the President was wrong. The new doctrine by which the President has now directed his subordinates to refuse records is novel, unfortunate, and menacing, and is at the very

essence of this entire issue. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin is presenting what he feels to be credible evidence that the Executive is not exercising due care. We have no other way, as I understand, to find out, unless some committee will demand the records, and unless the President will release them. How the Senator from Connecticut, himself, as chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, could determine regarding many matters, unless he had the files from the executive department, it is impossible for the Senator from Maine to understand.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer the question first, if I may. I thank the Senator from Maine very much for his statement. He is 100 percent correct. Unless we can obtain cooperation from the Executive, there is no way in the world of cleaning house. I am not giving my evaluation of the evidence, I want it understood. If Senators will listen, they will note that what I am doing is to recite the facts, which the State Department's own security agency dug up, and which information acted as the basis for their recommendation that the individuals in question, because of being security risks, be discharged and not retained in the service.

I know the Senator from Connecticut has not been present all the time. He has been away this evening. Some of the most incredible cases I have read and some that I shall read of giving a man top secrecy clearance, when the Department's own agency says "He is a bad risk; he is a Communist," have been uncovered. I may say to the Senator, if the investigative agency is overly eager, if they are doing a bad job, if they are persecuting individuals, if they are naming as Communists individuals who are not such, then it is up to the State Department and the President to get a new agency.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment, that I may make a final observation?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I shall be glad to yield; and after that I will yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McMAHON. It will only take me a minute. I understand the junior Senator from Massachusetts earlier said that at the next meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee he would move for an examination of these cases. I may say to the Senator, I shall be glad to second and to support the motion, because I should like to see developed not only the facts the Senator has been able to get, but also other facts that we as a committee may be able to develop. I should like to see that done. It would be quite all right with me, but I again emphasize, as I now take my seat—and I shall not participate in the debate again, so far as I know, and I shall not disturb the Senator further—that perhaps it would have been better had the Senator presented his complaint to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, in which committee I am sure he has full confidence, in order that the derogatory information might be weighed against any information which would tend to contradict it, so that we could have the benefit of that searching information before the Senator decided to come to the Senate floor with it. It is simply a personal observation. The Senator is within his rights. He has decided to do it differently. It is the Senator's responsibility. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator need not worry about disturbing me, because there is nothing I am more willing to do than to yield to a Senator. If I may have the Senator's attention, I will answer his question. I assume it was a question. The Senator suggested a course of action which he thinks I should have followed. As I explained earlier this evening, I thought of that. I thought there was some possibility of accomplishing the desired results in that fashion. However, keeping in mind that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and all the Senators have had substantially the same knowledge and opportunity that I have had, I questioned whether anything would be gained unless the President changed his mind and said, "I will give you the information." Then, when the leader of the Democratic Party, before seeing any of the evidence, made a speech in Chicago and said, "What the Senator from Wisconsin says is all untrue," I thought the only thing to do was what I have done, namely, to let the people of the country know what is going on, and then hope that the pressure of public opinion would be great enough to force the President to clean house. Frankly, I think he will not clean house until he determines it is politically inexpedient for him to do otherwise. I think the President is one of the cleverest politicians this Nation has ever had. I think when he discovers that the people of the country do not want a continuation of what is going on, there will be a housecleaning.

I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator familiar with the rule as laid down by the President that not only will he not permit any Member of the Congress or a congressional committee to have access to loyalty files, but that he will not permit the person in charge of them to testify before a committee as to any facts relating to a person's loyalty?

That was true in the Remington case, in which he told an admiral of the Navy, who had charge of one of the files containing disloyalty information, that the admiral was not permitted to testify in relation to it. Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore, it seems impossible for the committee which might be named to be successful unless the President of the United States should change his order. Does not the Senator feel that the proper committee to investigate the matter is the Appropriations Committee, which has to appropriate the money to pay those persons? The State Department's appropriation is now before that committee. I understand that Mr. Acheson will appear before the committee. That will be the place for the Senate actually to obtain information on those particular persons, not only as to whether they are now in Government employ, but information as to the entire record of the State Department, the FBI, and other departments as to their loyalty.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will say that any committee that looks into the matter will have all the cooperation I can give it. I shall be more than happy to go before the Appropriations Committee and give it all the information I have. I think the Appropriations Committee should certainly look into the question especially so in the case of the Voice of America.

I think the Voice of America program is a very important program if properly conducted. I think it is almost impossible to spend too much money on it if the money is wisely spent, but I think the picture which we find in connection with the New York office of the Voice of America should be examined by the Appropriations Committee and that that committee should use a bright light and find out exactly what is going on. I shall cover that matter in some detail when I get down to the final case.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that if it had not been for a congressional committee Alger Hiss would not have been convicted?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there is no doubt about that. The Senator will recall that at the time the House Un-American Activities Committee turned up the information on Hiss the President said, in a public statement, "We had all this information already." I do not know whether he had it, but if at that time the Un-American Activities Committee had decided to quit, Hiss might have been in Calcutta, instead of Service which might not have been too bad.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not reasonable to assume that in the file of Mr. Hiss there are possibly some good points as well as derogatory evidence?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think even the most fanatical Communist may treat his wife and children well; he may provide for them well. I do not think that is the question. The question is whether these persons are a threat to the United States. No matter how much good information there may be in the file regarding them, so long as they are loyal to Russia and to the Communist Party, and disloyal to this Government, I think they have no right to hold Government positions. I think it is a privilege to have a Government job, not a right.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that every man who has been convicted possibly had some good points about him, and there were some persons who would testify that he was a kindly and an honest man?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is certainly true.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not quite understand the argument which was used a little earlier, that there might be some good points in the files. What difference does it make how many good points there are if the persons involved are Communist sympathizers and fellow

travelers? Our jails are filled with persons who were perfectly honest up to the time they performed the acts or deeds which got them convicted. Is not that true?

Mr. McCARTHY. I take the position that it is not my task to take 81 cases and try and get all the evidence and then determine whether the intelligence unit which evaluates it was doing a good or a bad job. All I am doing is presenting enough of the picture so that I hope both the Democratic side and the Republican side will forget politics and help clean house. I think this is something in which we cannot think of politics as usual. If I were to give my Democratic friends some advice, it would be that I think we should get together and do some house cleaning. I notice the Senator from Mississippi frowning. I do not think he was present when I made it clear that if the Democratic Party as represented in the Senate had control of the executive branch I thought we would not have the sorry picture we have today.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact, to boil this all down, that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is simply asking that an appropriate committee of the Senate make a thorough investigation not only of the files but of any other source of information possible, and let that committee determine whether there are any disloyal persons or Communists, or what have you, such as the Senator has listed in these 81 cases? Is not that the whole crux of the matter?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Whether there are good things or bad things to be said about them, all the Senator is doing is asking that an investigation be made by an appropriate committee of the Senate. Whether that is correct procedure or not, the Senator is within his rights in asking it.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I do not think a Senate committee can do a complete job unless the President will make the facts available.

Mr. WHERRY. Whether an investigation will accomplish the very thing which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] labored about will depend on whether all the information in the files is forthcoming to the investigating committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I do not claim that all the cases I am reporting to the Senate refer to persons working in the State Department, but in view of the fact that most of them were in the State Department and had top-secret clearance, I think the Senate could call them before a committee and find out in what Government work they are now engaged, or, if they are not engaged in Government work, what they have been doing in private employment, and whether they are members of espionage rings. I am not concerned with the numbers over which the Senator from Illinois labored all night long, whether there are 205 or 57. It is a question of whether there are Communists in the State Department. As to three of them the record is so bad that I can find nothing good regarding them. I cannot conceive of the Secretary of State keeping them on. Under the McCarran law the Secretary of State has the absolute right to clean out any debris he cares to.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the distinguished Senator contacted the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations relative to the files which he now has? Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator mentioned that fact, I certainly should like to pay a compliment to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and other members of the committee, who have done a pretty good job in insisting upon the departments making reports as to the progress which is being made relative to the subversiveness of persons who are in the departments, and they could do a better job. I should like to state that if all other committees fail, I believe the Committee on Appropriations would be a very good place to start, because if appropriations are withheld from a department or an agency, it can be brought around very quickly.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have unlimited respect for the ability of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and I should like him to know now that at any time at all, tomorrow or the next day, or whenever he wants me to do so, I shall be glad to come to his committee and give him all the information I have. I believe the committee should decide after further and complete investigation, and after they have asked the President for the files, which of the names they wish to make public.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood the Senator to say that he had made an offer to the President of the United States. Will the Senator state what that offer was and how it was made?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to do so. From Nevada I sent a telegram to the President. I was out there making a Lincoln Day speech. I sent a telegram to the President telling him that I had names in my possession and that they were available to him. I have a copy of the telegram here.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. What kind of speech was the Senator making?

Mr. McCARTHY. A Lincoln Day speech.

Mr. WITHERS. I thought the Senator said it was a Republican speech.

Mr. McCARTHY. We call it a Lincoln Day speech.

Mr. WILEY. The appellations are synonymous.

Mr. McCARTHY. I sent a telegram to the President saying, in effect, "Mr. President, I have the names of 57 individuals in the State Department who are Communists, and those names are available to you." I suggested, however, that he dissolve the order for secrecy. Otherwise, just getting the names would be of no benefit. I heard nothing from the President, except that I read his statement at a press conference to the effect that the Senator from Wisconsin was not telling the truth.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. When did the Senator send this telegram to the President?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was approximately a week ago.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator has received no direct response whatever from the President or from the President's office?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have received no response from the President, and no acknowledgment. All I know is that according to the newspaper account the President is reported to have said that the Senator from Wisconsin was not telling the truth.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator inform the President in the telegram that the 57 persons are or have been in the State Department?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did.

Mr. DONNELL. Notwithstanding the notice given to the President by a Member of the Senate a week ago by telegram, there has been no response received by the Senator from the President?

Mr. McCARTHY. None whatever.

Mr. DONNELL. If these persons are Communists—and we are not deciding that question at the moment—they have been allowed, so far as the Senator knows, to continue in whatever official positions they occupied during the intervening approximate week. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I might say that I read the telegram into the RECORD. I shall be glad to hand a copy of it to the Senator. Since that time the majority leader also joined with the President in reflecting upon the truthfulness of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Has the Senator already placed in the RECORD a copy of the telegram which he has just handed me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have.

Mr. DONNELL. I missed that part of the Senator's address.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, the telegram is in the RECORD.

I believe I was on case No. 34. This individual was originally cleared for employment in the State Department on June 2, 1946. Since that time, according to the State Department's file, he has admitted his communistic sympathies. I understand that he has resigned in order to take other Government employment. He was not discharged.

Case No. 36. This individual is 43 years of age. He is with the Office of Information and Education. According to the file, he is a known Communist. I might say that when I refer to someone as being a known Communist, I am not evaluating the information myself. I am merely giving what is in the file. This individual also found his way into

the Voice of America broadcast. Apparently the easiest way to get in is to be a known Communist.

Case No. 37. This individual has been in the United States since 1930 and was employed by the Office of Information and Education on April 22, 1947. He worked for the Russian Embassy in Turkey for 3 years. From 1944 to 1947 he was with a Russian welfare society. This individual is a very close associate of a known Communist now also with the Voice of America broadcast. The note says that this individual is still with the Voice of America broadcast.

Case No. 38. This individual is employed in a very responsible position in the Broadcasting Division of the Voice of America. As early as December 10, 1946, investigation by the State Department's security agency showed that this man was a fanatical Communist, that he was anticapitalistic, and definitely followed the Communist Party line. In this case there were reports from two different Government investigative agencies. Another Government investigative agency advised that a reliable informant reported that a well-known Communist in Newark, N. J., gave him the unqualified information that this individual was a paid-up fellow party member. While acting as a newspaper reporter prior to his present employment with the Voice of America broadcast he was reported by his superiors to have colored his news reports with Communist theory, and did not give complete and unbiased coverage to such reports. That is important because it is this individual who is now handing out news reports on the Voice of America program. A very close friend of this individual and his brother stated that both are definitely communist.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. What is the gentleman's name? Did the Senator call his name?

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator did not call any name?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator does not know who it is?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have called no names. The Senator from Connecticut, I think, gave the best reason why, namely, that we should not attempt to try to convict a man, that that should be done by a committee. I am submitting the evidence without giving the names. I have avoided that in every way possible.

Mr. WITHERS. Does the Senator think all the employees in the State Department are Communists?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I think the vast majority of those employees are being done an almost irreparable wrong by having them painted with the brush of communism. I have been a lawyer, and out of 100 lawyers there may be 99 honest lawyers and 1 shyster; 1 crook, and the 99 get a bad name. That has happened in the State Department. If there were not some good, honest, loyal men in the State Department, men who were willing to risk their positions, I would not be able to give this report here tonight. I think the vast majority of those employees are loyal, protecting the security of the country for the time being, and in honesty to those employees the shady characters should be removed.

Mr. WITHERS. Will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. WITHERS. How does the Senator feel about attacking these men without calling names? How does the Senator feel the other employees who are straightforward feel about it, when he reflects on all of them and does not call names?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the condition today is so fraught with danger, I think we are in a period so definitely close to war, that even if we do damage some of the honest employees, I must take the only method I know of whereby I think we can secure a house cleaning. This information is nothing new. This has been known to the Secretary of State, or should have been—it is in the files—for a long time. I have decided that this is the best way of forcing the President to give the Congress the information so that it can clean house, as he apparently is not going to. Whether it is wrong, the Senator can decide for himself. I personally feel that this is the most effective way I can do this all-important job, and I intend to continue attempting to do it in this fashion, until the Senator or someone else shows me that there is some more effective, fairer way.

In that connection, I might say that I am very happy that there are so many Senators on the other side of the aisle who so thoroughly disagree with the majority leader. The majority leader has been condemning me rather vigorously for not giving the names of the people. I have been making every effort possible to keep the information in such form that no one can detect the names, until a full hearing of each case has been held.

Mr. WITHERS. I should like to ask the Senator what reason he has for not calling names. Does not the Senator think it would be a fine thing to let the public know who the guilty are? Is not the Senator privileged?

Mr. McCARTHY. Earlier this evening the Senator from Illinois said, "You are privileged if you make a mistake. If out of the 81 there are some innocent, if you malign them," the Senator from Illinois said, "you are protected." I made the statement then that when the day comes that I ever say anything on the floor of the Senate which I will not be willing to state off the floor of the Senate, on that day I will resign from the Senate.

Mr. WITHERS and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARTHY. I still yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WITHERS. If the Senator does not call names, has he not reflected on the whole Department of State, every one of the employees?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is entirely possible, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator has the right in the Senate to call those names.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. WITHERS. But the Senator refused to do so. The Senator asked if I could state a better way. I will say a better way is to give the Senate, the public, the press, and everyone the name of every person the Senator says labors under any suspicion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I do not think I will follow it, however, but I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. WITHERS. I would be better satisfied if I could go along with the Senator in that way. I would hate to follow the Senator only in part.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not trying to be humorous. I respect the Senator's judgment. I have given the matter a great deal of thought, however, and the way I am presenting the matter is the way I think it should be done, and I intend to present it in that fashion.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator simply tells us there are persons who are Communists but does not tell us who they are. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the Senator was not on the floor of the Senate all evening. I have stated repeatedly that I would go before any Senate committee and divulge names. I have said further that if it were the feeling of the majority of the Senate that they did not want it done in that fashion, that they feel we can do it in a better way, that we can do a better job by making the names public on the floor of the Senate I will be glad to abide by that decision. However I think that would be a mistake. I have dug out information which I think is of the utmost importance and I think we should get down to the job of trying to clean out these unusual people.

Mr. WITHERS. Does the Senator indict or accuse or what is he doing in this speech?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. WITHERS. Is the Senator indicting those whom he claims are guilty of the charges he makes?

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I indicting those who are guilty?

Mr. WITHERS. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not indicting those who are guilty. I am giving the Senate information about persons whom I consider to be Communists in the State Department.

Mr. WITHERS. In other words the Senator is suspicious that something is wrong without calling the names?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is a smart man. I know the Senator is. I have had many conversations with the Senator and I respect his intelligence. The Senator knows exactly what I am doing. The Senator knows I am giving the Senate what the State Department's investigative agency has said about these investigations. When the State Department's investigative agency has said that this man is a Communist, and that agency says he should not be working in the State Department, I am telling the Senate that. When the officials of the State Department say they will not

discharge the individual, anyway, I am giving that to the Senate. I am giving all the information I can to the Senate. The Senator from Kentucky knows exactly what I am doing.

Mr. WITHERS. Does the Senator know that I, like all others, am curious to know the names? When the Senator gives the cases, the press and country at large would like to know who they are.

Mr. McCARTHY. First let me say that this matter is too important for me to use it as a utensil whereby I can satisfy someone's curiosity, no matter how much I would like to see his curiosity satisfied. I do not intend to satisfy anyone's curiosity. I intend to do everything I can to try to clean up what I consider to be a bad mess.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, does the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not possible that the Senator from Kentucky might learn the names of these people sooner than he might like to?

Mr. WITHERS. I would like to know them if the Senator would tell me. I will make this observation. The Senator from Kentucky certainly could not learn the names too soon. If the individuals in question are guilty, I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that no American could learn their names too soon.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may suggest to the Senator, he is a member of the majority party, and I trust he is on much better terms with the President than I am. All the information I have given the Senate is in State Department files. There are several ways the Senator can obtain the names. No. 1. He can go to the President and say, "Mr. President, how about this case number so-and-so? Let me obtain the further facts on it."

Another way is to sit in when the proper committee asks for the names.

A third way, I will say to the Senator, is simply to come over to my office tomorrow morning and he can see the names, and I will satisfy his curiosity.

Mr. WITHERS. I shall be glad to. Does the Senator object to my divulging the names, if I see them? Have I that privilege?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is up to the proper committee——

Mr. WITHERS. I think we should tell the people who they are.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is up to the proper committee to decide whether it wants to divulge the names. Let me make myself clear to the Senator. If the majority of the Senate want me to divulge them in that fashion, yes. But I am not going to follow the Senator's advice and say, "Here you are, Senator, divulge them." Period.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator divulged four names in his speech in Reno, Nev. Why does the Senator refuse to divulge others before the Senate?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator knows that he is not stating the facts correctly. I read the speech I made.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. I read the speech I made.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh——

Mr. McCARTHY. Do not read to me from the Washington Post.

Mr. LUCAS. I have the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and a few other newspapers.

Mr. McCARTHY. I read to the Senate the speech I made at Reno, Nev. That speech was recorded. If the Senator wants a copy of that record I shall be glad to write to the Republican committee there and ask them to send the Senator a copy of the record. I think it will cost about $3 or three and a half. The Senator can play that record if he wants to. Otherwise, he can read what I read today into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I said there was a man, John Service, and I did not say he was one of the 57. An AP reporter called me and asked, "Were you naming the 57?" I said, "No. I did not say these people were Communists. They are not part of the 57." I said, "Here is John Service." I gave his record. Now I may think he is a Communist, but I do not have his file. His file for some mysterious reason has disappeared and is locked up in the safe of the top brass of the State Department. I discussed Service, who was picked up by the FBI when turning over State Department documents. I pointed out that while he was in China he recommended that communism was the hope of China. I commented, as I recall—and it is all in the RECORD here—on the fact that he was now on his way to Calcutta, India, to establish an Indian policy. I made it very clear that he was not one of the 57.

Then I took two other names and I said, "Here is what happens when you clear them out of the State Department." I gave the name of Mrs. Kenney, who had been listed by the FBI as a courier of the Communist Party while working for the Government. I pointed out that when she was forced out, because of public pressure and the FBI statement, that then she ends up where she is today, in one of the educational organizations or in some part of the UN Organization. I pointed out that the other one—and the Senator was present, and I should not have to repeat this again—who had been in the State Department as secretary to an Assistant Secretary of State. He was labeled as an outstanding Communist. When he was forced out of the State Department he went to work for the UN. I think both those individuals are Communists. Certainly if they are not, they look like them, they talk like them, and they walk like them. As one of my farmer friends once said, if a fowl looks like a duck and quacks like a duck and eats like a duck we can assume it is a duck. Those two individuals certainly answer that requirement.

Then I referred to a fourth one. I made it very clear that he had never been with the State Department. He is a man called Shapley. He headed up the peace conference in New York.

I pointed out to the Senate that Shapley had headed up this outfit that the State Department called a tool of Russia and a sounding board for Communist propaganda. That was in April. The State Department issued a press release in July, to the effect that they appointed this man on the advisory commission—I do not know the name of it—which advises the State Department on UNESCO. So I wish the Senator from Illinois would not plead ignorance of that. He knows it. I went over all this for the Senate earlier today.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I ask about these four is that it is my understanding the Senator did name them in his speech at Reno, Nev., and that the Senator said definitely—and I am now quoting only from the newspapers, and that is all I have been able to find out other than what the Senator has said tonight—in reply to a question by a reporter if he called these people traitors, he said, "I did not. I did not call them Communists either."

Is that what the Senator said?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator wants to argue about the four, I will say, so that his mind will be at ease, that if he wants me to make it 59 instead of 57 I shall be glad to include two individuals who were named, one by the FBI and the other by the Un-American Activities Committee as being a courier for the Communist Party.

I do not get the Senator's argument. Does he say these people are Simon pure and that I maligned them? I talked about them publicly. If anything I said was not true, they can sue me for libel and slander. If it will make the Senator happy, I will be glad to say that all of them except Service are part of the 57. The only reason I do not include Service is that his file has disappeared, and I am trying to confine myself solely to information which is confined by the State Department's own investigative agency.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have any quarrel with what the Senator says. The only thing I am trying to do is to reconcile the Senator's speech here with the speech reported in the newspapers, and I have not received a satisfactory answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. What would the Senator like to know?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know how he reconciles what he has said in the speeches he has made at Republican rallies with what he is saying here tonight. In other words, he named four persons when he was in the West. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that the sooner the Senator can name these persons, the better off we will all be. So far as I am concerned, it will not be in executive session. If I have anything to say about it, it will be in the

open, where every individual in America, every newspaperman can attend, so that they will know definitely, as soon as possible, just who is being charged and who is not being charged with being Communists. That is only fair, as the Senator from Kentucky has so ably pointed out, because every individual in the State Department tonight is under a cloud, he is under a shadow as the result of what the Senator from Wisconsin is doing. I want to get the honest-to-goodness Americans from under that shadow, and whatever Communists are there, the majority party on this side of the aisle will be found to be just as strong in demanding that we clean house, if the Senator has the proof, as is anyone else. The Senator does not need to worry about that.

But the Senator has been moving around here——

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator to wait a minute, please; I do not yield any further at this time.

The Senator from Illinois says it is my job to prove these things. Since when has it been the job of a Senator who is a member of the minority, Mr. President, to clean house for an executive department? That is the task of the majority, and I hope they take that task on their shoulders.

Nothing the Senator from Illinois has done here tonight indicates that he even remotely realizes the seriousness of this problem.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that when he makes that statement, he simply does not know what he is talking about. I appreciate the seriousness of the situation the Senator is discussing. No one understands it better than the Senator from Illinois and the country as a whole do, as a result of the speeches the Senator from Wisconsin has made upon this question. If the Senator thinks there is anything frivolous about this, or that we are not trying to cooperate with him in this matter, he simply does not understand the situation.

We are going to help get the facts, and the Senator from Wisconsin is going to help us get the facts. He says he has the evidence there. All that needs to be done is for the Senator to come forward, along with the persons in the Intelligence Department from whom he has been able to get the information in the State Department. We will have them here. The Senator will have to tell us that, of course, and we will ferret this out, from top to bottom.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Illinois now demands that the President allow the State Department to bring to a Senate committee all the information in the files on these individuals? Or does the Senator feel that that should be kept secret, and that it is my job to probe behind the iron curtain and get the information?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Wisconsin has already been behind the iron curtain.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Illinois says it is my task to get the information. Does not he realize that is the task of the majority party and the majority leader? Does not he agree with me that the President should say to the Congress, in all honesty and fairness, "Here is a serious situation. I will open the files and let the proper committee examine them and learn what the facts are"?

Mr. LUCAS. That is the old argument which has been advanced ever since the days of John Marshall in respect to controversies between the executive and legislative branches of Government relating to the opening of the files. We have had that question over and over again.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, does the Senator decline to yield to any Senator?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I simply do not wish to prolong what is completely pointless on the part of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The whole evening has been rather pointless.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understood the Senator to say, in referring to two men, that they walked like Communists, looked like Communists, and talked like Communists. I think if we could spot Communists by their looks——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York is asking a question, I yield; otherwise I do not yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will come to the question in a moment.

I think that if we could spot Communists by the manner in which they walk, our task in fighting communism would be far simpler than it is.

I would very much appreciate it if the Senator would tell us—and he would make a real contribution if he would—how he could spot any man as being a Communist, by his looks or by his walk. If he can do that, he certainly must have powers of perception which go far beyond anything known in human history.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I think it is a great mistake to take something that is so very important and try to make a farce of it. The Senator from New York is intelligent enough to know that if I say a man looks like a duck, eats like a duck, and walks like a duck I mean that in a figurative sense. The Senator likewise knows that if I say a man looks like a Communist, walks like a Communist, and talks like a Communist I mean that if a man associates with Communists and talks as Communists do and is very friendly with Communists, praises communism, attacks and belittles American democracy, joins Communist-front organizations, contributes money to them, and praises the Russian Communist system above our own, he probably is a Communist.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me observe——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think I should let the Senator from New York observe what he has in mind.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to point out that the Senator's answer certainly is not responsive to my question. He tried to identify these men as Communists—and they may be Communists—because, as he described them, they walk like Communists, they look like Communists, and they talk like Communists. That is an issue that is not new in politics. The accusation is made by the Senator——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me make clear that I have not seen them physically walk; I have not looked upon their faces; but when I speak of their looking like Communists and acting like Communists and walking like Communists, I am speaking of the record of those men and how they look in that record. The Senator from New York knows that.

I do not know whether those men are tall or short or fat or lean.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not think the Senator could describe a Communist by the way Communists look.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Referring to the request for secrecy in regard to these names, I ask the Senator whether he has tried to keep these names secret from the President of the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I have not. I have offered the names to the President.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether in the telegram he sent from Nevada about a week ago to the President, there appears this language:

> In the Lincoln Day speech at Wheeling, Thursday night, I stated that the State Department harbors a nest of Communists and Communist sympathizers who are helping to shape our foreign policy. I further stated that I have in my possession the names of 57 Communists who are in the State Department at present. A State Department spokesman promptly denied this, claiming that there is not a single Communist in the Department.

Then, omitting some intermediate portions of the telegram, does not the telegram to the President resume as follows:

> Despite this State Department black-out, we have been able to compile a list of 57 Communists in the State Department. This list is available to you.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator so telegraph the President?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator then continue in his telegram to the President, as follows:

> But you can get a much longer list by ordering Secretary Acheson to give you a list of those whom your own board listed as being disloyal, and who are still working in the State Department.

Is that a part of the telegram the Senator sent?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred to having spoken at Wheeling on Thursday night. That was Thursday night, February 9; was it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Where did the Senator speak the next night?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not speak anywhere the next night. The telegram

was sent on Saturday, the 11th, in the afternoon.

Mr. DONNELL. So 9 days have elapsed since the sending of that telegram to the President of the United States, signed by the Senator from Wisconsin, I assume. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator has not yet received any response?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator ever at any time indicate to the President of the United States that he would not reveal the names of the 57, upon the President's request?

Mr. McCARTHY. In order to keep the RECORD absolutely clear, let me say that the telegram places no conditions upon my offer to reveal the names. However, in talking to some members of the press several days later, I told them I did not think I would feel free to give the President the names if he were going to maintain the iron curtain of secrecy, and merely say, "57 more red herrings," and claim that the men were simon pure, with no investigation made.

At that time I did indicate that a condition in connection with giving him the names would be that he draw back the iron curtain of secrecy. That condition was not stated in the telegram, but in fairness to the President I say that I assume that the condition was brought to his attention.

Mr. DONNELL. And if it does draw back the iron curtain of secrecy, of which the Senator from Wisconsin spoke, the Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly willing to give the President the names of every one of the 57 persons; is he?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no question about that. Furthermore, I urge that the proper Senate committee convene, and I shall be glad to give the committee the names.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator from Wisconsin will give that committee every name; and the Senator offered a few moments ago, did he not, to give to the Senator from Kentucky, himself, personally, the names, tomorrow morning, if he wants them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I withdrew that, however, because the Senator said he wishes to make the information public.

I have been a lawyer for a long time, as the Senator from Missouri has; and I am convinced of the communistic connections of these persons—although it is true that some of them might not have paid dues to the Communist Party. But the reports are so convincing that I am confident those persons are working closely with the Communist Party.

Nevertheless, I do not think that, as a general proposition, one Member of the Senate should rise on the floor of the Senate and should make public the names of 81 persons in that way. If the matter were so urgent that that would be the only way to proceed, the names could be gotten, that would be another matter. But all of us will be back tomorrow, a committee can be convened tomorrow, and I am perfectly willing to give the names to a committee.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly willing to give the names to a Senate committee. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the majority of the Senate thinks it is proper to make them public on the floor of the Senate, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. A moment ago the distinguished minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], demanded the regular order. I second that demand. The Senator from Wisconsin is discussing an unsurpassably important question. He should be permitted to conclude his address without further interruption, and we should be permitted to hear all that he has to say without being required to sit up all night like wild cats and having to sleep all day tomorrow like hoot owls. Therefore I purpose to object to any further yielding by the Senator to anyone, for any purpose except that of asking a question, and I shall demand the strict enforcement of the rule.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield only for a question.

Mr. WITHERS. I wish to ask one or two questions.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for as many questions as the Senator wishes to ask.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator from Wisconsin stated a short time ago that he would not disclose the names of the persons to the President unless the President would use the names and would pull back the iron curtain; the Senator from Wisconsin said he would give the names to the President if he would start to work on them.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, Senator, this is not a game.

Mr. WITHERS. Wait a minute. I asked the Senator a question. Let him answer it.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I answer the Senator?

Mr. WITHERS. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. It may not be the answer the Senator wants, but it will be an answer. I may say to the Senator, this is not a game. I have told the President he could have the names, and subsequently I indicated I felt it would be useless to give him the names and let him issue a whitewash statement, saying "57 red herrings." I felt that the minimum the American people could ask for was that he revoke the rule which, so far as I know, had never been in existence before he enforced it. He should not be worried about a Congress which has a majority of his own party, and when he does that, he can have the names. But I do not want the names buried behind a curtain of secrecy. I have enough confidence in the Senate however to feel that any committee of the Senate, when it gets the information and takes the trouble to go over it, together with the names, will insist that the President give them the information to which they are entitled. I believe perhaps the American people, both Democrats and Republicans—and I do not think, Mr. President, there will be found any party line of division—the 150,000,000 American people will say to the President, "Mr. President, you cannot hide these Communists behind an iron curtain. Give the Congress the information which is in the files; let them know; let them decide whether or not a house cleaning is in order." I am sure that if the Senator sits in on the hearings—and I hope they are extended—I am sure before he gets through he will agree with me 100 percent.

Mr. WITHERS. I want to ask the Senator this question: If I understand the Senator, he would not give the names to the President, unless the President would use them. Now, I asked the Senator for the names. The Senator said he would give me the names. I told the Senator I wanted to use them, and he would not give them to me, because I was going to use them. In other words, the Senator refused to give them to the President, because he would not use them, and he refused to give them to me, because I intended to use them. Does the Senator find himself in an inconsistent attitude in that respect?

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder whether we have understood each other. I told the Senator if he came to my office tomorrow morning he could have all the names. As I understand the Senator—and I may have been mistaken—he said he would make them public.

Mr. WITHERS. Yes, that is using them.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is using them.

Mr. WITHERS. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the Senator from Kentucky is correct; the Senator from Wisconsin will not give him the names in the morning.

To continue. We were on Case No. 38. This individual is employed in a very responsible position in the Broadcasting Division of OIE, the Voice of America. As early as December 10, 1946, an investigation by the State Department's own security agency was to the effect that this man was a fanatical Communist; that he is anticapitalistic and definitely follows the party Communist line. Another investigative agency advised that a reliable informer reported that a well-known Communist in Newark, N. J., gave him the unqualified information that this individual was a paid-up party member. I believe I have commented on the fact that here we have two Federal security agencies, each reporting the same thing. I believe I have read this, in regard to his activities as a newspaper reporter.

At the time he organized a strike and picket line, he had repeated conferences with a well-known New York Communist whose name is, of course, in the State Department's report. The State Department's own security agency recommended that this individual not be retained. However, as of today he is in the extremely important position in the broadcasting division of the World-Wide News Unit of OIE, in New York City, thereby to at least some extent controlling information which we are giving to the balance of the world. Do Senators follow this? This is a man who in

1946 was reported, not by one agency but by two, and the security agency recommended that he be dismissed. That was 3 or 4 years ago. The man is still in that very important position. This seems to be one of the most dangerous cases we have. In view of the Secretary's statement that he would discharge before sundown any Communists now in the State Department whose name was brought to his attention, I suggest that he immediately take action on this individual. He can start on him. The Secretary has about 12 hours more or less, in fact, about 18 hours, before sundown. He can show his good faith by discharging this man. He should have no trouble whatever finding him. He will find that two Federal investigative agencies said, "This man is a Communist, do not keep him; get rid of him." He will find that the man is still working. The Secretary, in case he has not acquainted himself with the McCarran bill, will note that he has the absolute right to terminate this man's services tomorrow. I should like to hope that we would get word from the Secretary to the effect that he had done so.

Case No. 39. This individual was appointed on January 2, 1947, as an economic analyist in Research and Intelligence. Again we find the old pattern back in Intelligence. He had been employed by the Soviet Purchasing Commission for a period from 1932 to 1945. In other words, he worked for the Soviet Purchasing Commission for 13 years. It was established by the State Department's own investigator that this individual could not have qualified for a position with the Soviet Purchasing Commission unless he were a member of the Communist Party. Despite this fact, this individual was given a job in Intelligence; which, as may have been noted, seems to be a favored spot for the Communists.

As to this individual, I frankly do not know whether he is now in the State Department or not.

Case No. 40 is that of another individual in Research, in the State Department since 1947. I do not have too much information on this, except the general statement by the agency that there is nothing in the files to disprove his communistic connections. He is still with the Government.

Case No. 41 is that of an individual born in 1910 in Cleveland, Ohio, appointed to a high position with the State Department, drawing the sum of $8,478.75 as an Assistant Chief in the Division of Occupied Areas. He is still in a high-paid position in the State Department. Investigation by the State Department's own security agency disclosed that most of his close associates and friends have records as fellow-travelers and Communists. He admitted having contributed money to a Communist-front organization.

There is a memorandum in the file to the effect that Joe Panuch had made considerable efforts to get this man out of the State Department. He was unsuccessful, however, and, incidentally, the information I get—and this is not so much from the files—is that this man Panuch tried to do a job of housecleaning and was given somewhat of a free hand under Jimmy Byrnes in starting to accomplish the job. However, when Byrnes left and Marshall took over—Senators will recall Acheson was then Under Secretary—the first official act of General Marshall was to discharge the man, Panuch. Obviously, General Marshall did not know anything about the situation. Some one of the underlings said, "Get rid of this man." It would seem to be only the logical thing that he would not, as his first official act, discharge a man, unless the Under Secretary said, "Get rid of him;" which is rather unusual. Here is one man who had tried to do the job of housecleaning, and the ax falls.

Case No. 42. This individual came to the United States in 1940, and was naturalized in Alabama in 1943. He returned to Germany as a civilian employee of the War Department in November 1946. He was appointed by the State Department to one of our intelligence departments. Both his brother and sister are listed as possible agents of the Comintern, and are active in Communist circles. There was evidence recommending dismissal. The report is that the evidence is sufficient to recommend dismissal. There is no information that indicates anything other than close Communist connections. Despite this fact, this man was never fired, but finally resigned in June 1947.

Case No. 43 is that of an individual who is a research analyst in the Division of Research for the Far East. He was recommended for the position by an individual who was listed by the FBI as a principal in a Soviet espionage case. The record indicates he is running very closely with a pack of Communists. This again is the old pattern—one Communist gets into a department, and he recommends another. In this case the FBI said the man who was trying to get him in is a principal in a Soviet espionage case.

Case No. 44. This is a rather interesting case of an individual who was sent to Paris to represent the State Department. A note dated September 15, 1947, listed him as cleared for Unesco placement. He was described in reports by various witnesses as interested in communism and by his roommate at the International House as a Communist. He pals around with a friend of two individuals known to be either Communists or fellow travelers. There is something in his file which I think is rather interesting. A note addressed to "David" and signed "M" inquires as to whether there is danger of this individual having another mental breakdown, which he had at one time in the past. While I do not have the exact wording of the note it, in effect, says get rid of this man, otherwise he may break and cause embarrassment if Congress gets ahold of him. The note is contained in the man's private file. It is a pencil note. Reading such stuff as this, one is not surprised at the President's action in signing the order, lowering the curtain.

Case No. 45 is the case of an individual who was a ranking official in the Office of Financial Development Policy. He was appointed in August 1946. Investigation indicates that he was very closely tied up with at least three individuals who have been named as Communists. He also recommended for appointment an individual very closely tied up with a Communist, who has been named as an espionage agent. So far as I can discover, this man was never discharged, but apparently resigned later, whether to take other government employment or private employment, I do not know.

Case No. 46 is the case of a man who holds a high position in the State Department. He had been affiliated with the magazine Amerasia from May 1937 to November 1941. This magazine consistently followed the Communist Party line. It was under the direction of Philip Jaffe and William Vanderbilt Field. Field has been a leading Communist and was one of the heads of the American Peace Mobilization, which the President and the Secretary of State publicly labeled as a tool of communism. Jaffe, as Senators will recall, was convicted and fined in connection with the John Service incident. It will be recalled that the FBI picked up Service for having delivered secret State Department documents to Amerasia. The State Department files show that this individual has been working very closely with these two men. On March 22, 1946, the State Department's own security agency recommended as follows:

> It is recommended that action be instituted to terminate subject's service with the State Department. It is suggested to achieve this purpose that an appropriate officer of the Department should inform him that his continued presence in the Department is embarrassing to the Department and that he be given an opportunity to resign. If he should not resign voluntarily, action should be instituted under Civil Service Rule No. 12, to terminate his services with the Department.

The Department, however, took no action upon this recommendation.

After that recommendation, the files show that this individual requested a fellow traveler to seek a position with the Board of Economic Warfare. The file further shows that this individual has been visited on several occasions by an alien fellow traveler. He has also recommended two former employees of the Amerasia Editorial Board to positions with the State Department. In other words, Mr. President, the usual tactics of getting into an important position and then bringing in fellow Communists.

A report dated August 18, 1947, recorded an interview with a former member of the Editorial Board of Amerasia who labeled this individual as "far to the left—awfully close to a fellow traveler." This individual was a subscriber to the Daily Worker. The file names a Communist Party member who has twice worked for this individual. The Biographical Register of the State Department shows him to be still in a position of importance there.

Case No. 47. This individual was employed in March 1944, as Division Assistant in the Division of Internal Security. The House Un-American Activities Committee advised on August 18, 1947, that an admitted former Communist Party member was formerly associated with this individual in Communist activities

in Washington, D. C. This individual's husband admitted having been a member of the Communist Party. The husband now has a highly confidential position with the Navy Department. The file indicates that this individual has been associated with a group of known Communists.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, that she was given a job in the Division of Internal Security.

A report dated July 16, 1947, states that in 1941 a Senate investigating committee had found that both this individual and her husband were members of the Communist Party. A report dated September 15, 1947, by a Government investigative agency, advised that a reliable informant reported this individual as a Communist, and that she has been recently contacting a member of the Soviet espionage ring. This individual is still in a highly paid job in the State Department.

Cases Nos. 48 and 49. One of these individuals is in the State Department in the Division of Occupied Areas. The wife is with the State Department in the Division of Research and Intelligence. The file shows that both the husband and wife are known to be close associates of individuals linked with Soviet espionage activities. Nevertheless, the wife was approved for top-secret material on the 11th of February 1947. The order approving her is rather unusual, in that it states, in effect, that the reason for her being approved for top secret material was that there was insufficient information to warrant her discharge on grounds of disloyalty.

Case No. 50. This individual is an executive secretary in the State Department. He has been reported by another Government investigative agency as having been in contact with a Soviet espionage agent. He is also a close friend of two employees of the State Department who are under investigation because of Communist associates.

Case No. 51. This individual agreed that he was responsible for the State Department's having employed an individual in one of the cases which I covered earlier today. It will be recalled that No. 14 was the case of an individual having furnished material to a known secret espionage ring and who had consistent contacts with long lists of Communists and suspected Soviet agents. He is still holding an important position in the State Department.

Case No. 52. This individual works for No. 16—I think that is the correct number—who, the State Department files indicate, was one of the most dangerous espionage agents in the Department. This individual was also temporarily employed as a correspondent of another individual listed as a Soviet agent by a Federal investigative agency. He and his wife are also close associates of two other alleged espionage agents who are named in the State Department files. He is presently holding a high-salaried and important position in the State Department and has been given top-secret clearance.

Here is a rather important case. In fact, they are all important. This is case No. 53, involving an individual who has been named by a confessed Communist spy as part of his spy ring. Prior to that time, on August 19, 1946, another governmental agency received information to the effect that he was a recognized leader of the Communist underground. This individual is, in my opinion, Mr. President, one of the most dangerous Communists in the State Department.

Case No. 54. This individual has been connected with a number of Communist-front organizations and was active in attempting to secure the issuance of a nonimmigration visa to a French Communist leader. This individual is presently employed in the State Department.

Cases No. 55. This individual was a close friend and associate of an individual described earlier in the day. It will be recalled that he was a very close associate of Soviet agents. A previous employer of this individual described her as having been "wrapped up" in communism and that she later married a man who was also a Communist. The files of the Department show that "she and her husband are contacts of a subject in the —— espionage case." The case referred to is a recent and very important Communist case.

Case No. 56. This individual was born in Russia and naturalized in San Francisco in 1929. Two former supervisors on non-Government jobs had recommended him unfavorably. The only favorable reference he had was from three Russian individuals, all in Government employment. He roomed with one of the Russians who had recommended him. The Navy Department informed the State Department that this individual had secret State Department documents in the room shared by him and the other Russian. An investigation was instituted, the outcome of which I do not know. However, this individual was still in the State Department as late as December 1949.

Case No 57. This individual was employed by the State Department in 1946 as a P-7 consultant. On June 7, 1946, a Government investigative agency advised that this individual was the contact man for a Russian espionage ring.

This report also included information to the effect that he had played bridge and exchanged language lessons with persons in the Soviet Embassy. On June 7, 1946, the same investigative agency reported that a known Soviet espionage agent was arrested with his wife in Finland in the 1930's and that while in custody this espionage agent's wife has requested the American Consul to forward on her behalf a request for funds from this individual. This individual had been in charge of the training of Soviet marines at one time at a Russian port. Nevertheless, this individual, on September 11, 1947, was given top secret clearance. The clearance officer in this case said:

> In the absence of additional highly derogatory information I feel that top secret clearance should be given.

I have been unable to find out whether this individual is working with the State Department at the present time, and, if not, whether he is in private or Government employment.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he has submitted the names represented by the reports he has read and the other approximately 250 names to which references have been made? Has he submitted those names to the Secretary of State?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not follow the Senator's question. Have I submitted 250 names?

Mr. LEHMAN. I asked whether the Senator had submitted to Secretary Acheson the names represented by the reports which he has read, as well as the other approximately 250 names to which references have been made. The reason I mentioned 250 names is because I am adding the 57 names to the 205 names which have been mentioned on several occasions. I ask whether those names or any substantial number of them have been submitted to the Secretary of State?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have given Secretary Acheson nothing—period.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not understand the Senator's answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said I have given Secretary Acheson nothing—period. So that there may be no confusion, and I think I have explained it twice to the Senator—the Senator is not dull and knows what I am talking about—the 205 persons who were mentioned in Secretary Byrnes' letter were those whom the State Department refused to fire after the Security Agency had recommended that they be fired. I told the Senator that I did not have those names. All I have is the total number. The Secretary of State has those names, however. All he needs to do is to go to his files.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator for conceding that I am not dull, but I still do not understand why these names have not been submitted to the Secretary of State. I can understand the Senator's unwillingness to submit to this body or to any other public body the names of men accused on somewhat unsubstantiated charges, but I do not understand his unwillingness to submit the names to the responsible official, the head of the State Department, whom he is accusing of laxness. I wonder whether the Senator will make some further explanation in order that the matter may be clear to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am afraid that if it is not clear to the Senator now I shall never be able to make it clear to him, no matter how much further explanation I make. I told the Senator that the Secretary of State has the names as to which I am reading the numbers. They are in the files of the Secretary of State. I am giving the Senator information which is confirmed by information in the files in the Office of the Secretary of State. It should be clear to the Senator that all the information which I am giving on the floor of the Senate has been available to the Secretary of State for a long time. If the Secretary of State does not know

that the investigative agency has recommended that certain individuals be discharged, he can easily check and find out. The files are all in his possession.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know, or can he tell Senators, whether or not the loyalty board has checked any of these persons whom he is describing here by numbers?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have just told the Senator I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I do not believe that the name "loyalty board" has come into the debate as yet. But I am not sure. I was not clear as to what agency the Senator was referring to.

Mr. McCARTHY. The name I used was "investigative agency." When employees from temporary war agencies were transferred to the State Department, a board was set up to screen them. Whether that was called the loyalty board, I do not know. It was an investigative agency. I do not know that at any one time there were two investigative agencies. There may have been.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the Senator correctly, the persons who are represented by the numbers which he has now given to the Senate, without giving any names, have been recommended to be discharged by the loyalty board selected by the President of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether that is correct. I have tried to make this clear. I do not have the names of all the individuals the loyalty board recommended be discharged. I found in the reports, however, a sizable number whom the investigative agency has recommended should be discharged. Let me make that clear. There was one group of 205, back in 1946. Since that time the investigative agency recommended that other groups be discharged. The treatment which was given to those recommendations was substantially the same as was given to the recommendations in 1946. In 1946, Secretary Byrnes said, out of 285, 79 were discharged. That is the first group. With subsequent groups the same action was taken. I have never had the names of all the groups. I do not even know how many there are. I know 206 is the definite number in the first group, because the Secretary of State has said there were 206.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator familiar with the personnel of the loyalty board?

Mr. McCARTHY. Frankly, I am not.

Mr. LUCAS. If it should turn out that some of the individuals whom the Senator has named by number have been cleared by the loyalty board, would that affect the Senator's opinion with respect to those persons?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would have to know something of the personnel of the loyalty board. When Communists are able to get their men into the Central Intelligence Agency and into the highest spots in the State Department, I assume that a prize target would be the loyalty board. So I cannot tell the Senator what I would think of this board's recommendations. If I had an FBI report on the loyalty board, and if it were a good, competent board, certainly that would mean something to me. However, when I find that some individuals who have been reported by the investigative agency to be Communists were given top-secret clearance, and if the loyalty board is in charge of giving top-secret clearance, it would indicate that the loyalty board is not too competent.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what part the loyalty board has played in this investigation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Nor do I.

Mr. LUCAS. But I am sure they will be in it, because undoubtedly they have checked and double checked these individuals who are now identified by numbers. The Senator will find that the President's loyalty board is headed by a very capable and competent lawyer by the name of Seth Richardson, who is a very representative Republican and a tremendously loyal American. I see two Senators on the Republican side rising.

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

Mr. NEELY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. All I say is that I hope the Senator will look at the names of the members of the Loyalty Board.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any Senator making a speech in the time of the Senator from Wisconsin. I made that statement before. He will either hold the floor or lose it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I might say that I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will yield in a moment. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. The hour is getting late, and I am very willing to yield for a question, but if I am to finish these remarks tonight, I do not care to yield for any more speeches.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely desired to ask the Senator whether he knew that Seth Richardson was the head of the loyalty appeals board, and not the board which might be operating in the State Department.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that Mr. Richardson has no jurisdiction whatsoever over any State Department employee, unless a State Department employee feels he has been badly treated, and appeals to Mr. Richardson's board. But Mr. Richardson does not pass upon any of the cases originally. If the State Department fails to fire a man who should be discharged, then nothing comes to Mr. Richardson.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Senator is speaking about a security committee, composed of State Department employees, rather than a loyalty board, and that he is speaking about a committee that was in existence prior to the loyalty board?

Mr. McCARTHY. I might say that I do not know what the technical name of the investigative agency is. I know that within the State Department investigations are conducted. Some of those investigations may be conducted by the FBI; I do not know. I find, however, that in some cases information is received from several investigative agencies. What the technical names are, I frankly do not know.

Case No. 58. This individual was a research analyst with OSS from July 1944 to September 1945, when he was transferred to the State Department, where he is presently in the Research Division. He has been a member of at least one Communist-front organization. For many years he has been a close friend of an important subject in a Russian espionage case, both residing in the same apartment building. A Government investigative agency reported on July 11, 1947, that he was a member of the Communist Party. Now I ask the Senate to listen to this. He is holding an important position in the State Department today, even though he was reported on July 11, 1947, to be a member of the Communist Party.

Case No. 60. This individual was employed by OSS, in the Division of Research, from June 1942 to September 1945, at which time he was transferred to the State Department. He is now a branch chief in Research and Intelligence. One of his former suprevisors stated that he was a Communist.

For some time he has resided with another State Department employee, previously mentioned herein, whose investigation was requested because of communistic activities. Nevertheless, this individual has been cleared and is still working in an important position where he handles top-secret material in the State Department.

Case No. 61. This individual is employed in Research and Intelligence in the State Department. He has been very active in UPWA, and one of his references has been closely affiliated with Communist-front organizations. A Government investigative agency has indicated the very strong possibility of a close tie-up between this individual and another Communist. The file indicates that additional investigations in this case are necessary. He is still in the State Department.

Case No. 62. This file is not important insofar as communistic activities are concerned, but rather is important because it sheds light on some rather unusual mental aberrations of certain individuals in the Department. In this connection, it perhaps should be mentioned that the types of individuals described in this file are regarded as bad security risks by most investigative agencies for the reason that they are rather easy blackmail victims. This file I recommend to the attention of any committee that cares to investigate it. It goes into some detail in regard to the peculiar—how can we put it—the pecu-

liar mental twists. I was trying to handle this matter delicately. I think this will be of interest to the committee in that it gives a rather interesting picture of some rather unusual mental twists of these gentlemen who are tied up with some of the Communist organizations.

Also it is confirmation of what I believe I mentioned earlier this evening when I was talking about one of the top investigators in Washington. I said to him, "Why do you find so many people fanatic about communism? Is there something that is so inviting about it? Is there something mentally wrong?" He said, "You will find if you search deep enough that there is something mentally or physically wrong with every one of them." There is certainly something wrong with this group. I might say that the new security officer has recommended that they get rid of all that type of individuals regardless of whether they are shown to have any communistic connection or not.

Case No. 63. This individual is employed by the State Department in Research and Intelligence. He was with Army Intelligence from 1944 to June 1946. In April 7, 1947, he was given a security clearance from the State Department. The files of the State Department investigative agency show that he is a very close associate of a former War Department employee who was dropped because it was believed he passed information and material to Soviet agents. One of his associates at the War Department, with whom he has since been in contact, is an individual who has been very active with communistically inclined groups. He has been a very close associate of another known Communist sympathizer. He has been given top secret clearance despite association with other known Communist sympathizers.

Case No. 64. This individual is presently employed in Research and Intelligence in the State Department. Again we find them in Research and Intelligence. The investigative agency files show that informants stated that he and his wife maintained a communistic and un-American attitude. The file indicates that the wife admitted being a member of the Communist Party. The file further shows that he is a close friend of a number of Russian agents connected with a major espionage case.

The investigation of this case was held up because the investigation at that time might have upset the investigation of what was considered a major espionage case, which was in the process of investigation. This individual apparently still enjoys clearance to top-secret documents.

Case No. 65. This individual is also still in the State Department in the Office of Information and Education and holds an important position. It would appear from his activities that he is very definitely communistically inclined. However, it is entirely possible that this individual is merely a left-winger who has been dominated by No. 81, who will be covered later, and a group of Communists and fellow travelers who have surrounded No. 81, to the extent that he has received credit for many of the Communist activities of No. 81. By No. 81 I refer to the case which I shall cover shortly. For that reason, while the work flowing from his office would indicate that he is sympathetically inclined at least toward Communists, I would hesitate in labeling him as such. In any event, however, I feel that he certainly is a bad risk in that position.

Case No. 66. This individual is also employed by the State Department as a music director in the Voice of America. He was listed on the draft classification as 4–F because of being a psychoneurotic. He and his mother, with whom he lived, provided a coffee kitchen for communistically inspired protest groups. He also worked for a time for a Communist-dominated organization. He studied for a time in the New School for Social Research under Hans Eisler, who, Senators recall, appeared before the House Un-American Committee. This individual is mentioned principally because he seemed to be representative of the group which accumulated around No. 81, whom I consider one of the big shots.

Case No. 67. This individual was employed by OWI in March 1942, and transferred to the State Department when that agency was taken over by the Department. After a meeting of Communists and Communist sympathizers, he was arrested for disorderly conduct. Two members of the Soviet underground attempted to get him out of difficulty and hush up matters so he would not lose his position in the State Department, which indicates that he is of importance to the Soviet underground. This information was set forth in detail in a memorandum, dated June 17, 1946, by an investigative agency, and brought to the attention of the State Department. However, this individual was still with the State Department in June 1947, and still had top-secret clearance. On July 16, 1947, a hearing was finally held. I am not aware of the outcome of this hearing. However, my best knowledge is that he is no longer with the State Department, but whether he resigned, was discharged, or whether he received a job with some other Government agency I do not know. I feel this case is important, Mr. President, for a number of reasons; one of them being that after it was definitely proven that the Communist underground had a deep interest in this man, and wanted to help him out, he still was given access to top-secret material for more than a year.

Case No. 68. This individual was with the OIE. He signed Communist Party petitions in which he alleged that he was a member thereof, as did his parents also. On November 4, 1941, the Civil Service Commission recommended his removal from the Government. This was never acted upon. He is still in the State Department and has been given top clearance.

Case No. 69. This individual was also employed by the OIE. However, little information was available on him except that he is a Russian, and that his sister is a known Communist and that he associates closely with Communists.

Case No. 70. This individual again is the typical Voice of America employee. The investigative agencies have indicated that he is affiliated with Communist-front organizations and has communistic sympathies. He is still with the State Department.

Case No. 71. This individual was employed by OIE in February 1943. He entered the United States in 1942 illegally. He is a Bulgarian. He lived 6 months with the editor of a Communist-controlled Bulgarian newspaper. He is a close associate of known Communists.

The Government investigative agency reported that the subject was reluctant to bear arms during the war, and that he faked inability to understand or speak English so as to avoid the draft. He was issued a certificate of naturalization on October 8, 1945, on a false petition which stated that he entered the United States on May 6, 1941. He is still working for the State Department, despite a rule that aliens shall not work therein, and while I have not been able to go into the matter completely, I have been informed that he also has top-secret clearance.

Case No. 72. This case, Mr. President, is interesting in that it is the direct opposite from the cases I have been reading. I cite it to show that unless one has a communistic background one cannot qualify for a position with the Voice of America, at least in the New York office. This man applied for a job with the Voice of America. He was investigated in the fall of 1946 for a position on the Russian desk of OIE. Investigation showed he was a refugee from the Red revolution. He was naturalized in 1927. He has a reputation as an expert in Russian affairs, having studied them for a period of many years. He was employed with OSS from February 1942 to December 1942, and then was requested to resign. He was forced to resign because of Communist pressure. A known Communist and a NKVD agent in the United States openly stated, according to the Intelligence files, that he was too anti-Communist to be employed by OSS. This man's immediate superior with OSS told him he was forced to fire him because of circumstances beyond his control. A high State Department official confirmed the reason for this man's dismissal from OSS.

This individual was very highly recommended by several witnesses as a high type of man, a democratic American, who supported democracy for Russia and opposed communism. However, he was turned down and was never employed by OIE. This was at a time when they were taking on all the other debris I have just described. Fortunately, however, his services are being presently made use of by McCloy in Germany, where he is acting fiscal adviser and, I understand, doing a good job. I believe I overlooked stating that he was born in Kiev, Russia, in 1877. I do not confuse this man, as I said, as being a Communist. The reason I cite the case is to show that the one good, sure way not to get into the Voice of America is that one is a loyal American and not an anti-Communist.

Case No. 73. This individual is in the Foreign Service. He was born in 1913, practiced law from September 1936 to September 1942. He was with the Board of Economic Warfare from November 1942 to September 1943. He has been with the State Department as a senior economic analyst from September 1943 until the present time. He was an applicant for a position as Foreign Service career officer. An investigative report dated June 1947 disclosed that he has always associated with known leftists and was highly recommended by four well-known fellow travelers. While in California his closest associates for several years were two active Communists. A former law associate for this individual refused to recommend him for Federal employment, stating he was extremely far to the left. A memorandum in his file dated December 12, 1946, requested investigation of black-market activities on his part in Spain. No report on this point, however, has been made available. A superior court judge in California, who has known the subject well, stated that under no circumstances would he recommend him for a Government position, because of his extreme leftism, and that he would not have him in any responsible Government position. Another California judge said this individual associated closely with fellow travelers, and he would definitely not recommend him. This individual, to the best of my knowledge, is still in Foreign Service, stationed in Madrid, Spain.

Case No. 74. This individual was employed on an American mission to the Far East during 1947. Intelligence units indicated that he was furnishing information to a Russian agent, and two sources of information reported that he was representing himself as an American intelligence agent. At that time he had been given clearance to confidential information. He was relieved of his particular assignment and transferred to different work within the Department.

Case No. 75. This individual was employed in December 1946 in the Foreign Service in the State Department. According to the files in the Department, he is a known contact of two suspects in the investigation of Soviet espionage activities in the United States. The investigative report dated March 1947 showed he sent material to one of the Soviet espionage suspects who had previously given him the names of two well known Communists whom he could contact abroad.

Case No. 76. This does not involve communistic activities, but does shed some light upon the possible reasons for some individuals' being employed by the State Department. This involves the case of a young man who was very patently incompetent and who had made gross misstatements in his application. He was turned down for employment. One of the superiors in the Department then wrote a note to the officer who had the task of deciding whether or not to employ this young man. That was after pressure had been applied from above to get him a job. The following is the comment made by the employing officer: "If ——— is so little concerned with the quality of Department personnel, there is little we can do. I believe he is more interested in the politics of the situation."

That is signed and dated.

Case No. 77. This young man applied for a position in the State Department. The file indicates he is a very close friend of reported Communists, and that he is closely associated with members of Communist-front organizations. The file indicates that his wife belongs to an organization listed as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee, and that a relative of his has a financial interest in the Daily Worker.

Mr. President, I believe I have covered this case before, and what I have just said seems to be a repetition. This is the case of a young man who ended up as a speech writer in a well-known house in Washington.

Case No. 78. This individual has made application for a P-8 position in the State Department. He has been employed by the Treasury Department from April 1940 up to the present time, except for military release from July 1942 to December 1942. State Department files show that he was highly recommended by two individuals engaged in Soviet espionage activities. Another Government investigative agency indicated that he was one of the contacts of the subject of a Soviet espionage case. One of his references refused to recommend him because of his association with pro-Communists. This individual is still holding a high-salaried position with the Treasury Department, in work, as I understand, directly with the State Department.

Case No. 79. This individual is on the special project staff at the State Department. The intelligence report in his file indicates that numerous informants reported he was pro-Communist, radical, and of dubious background. However, I understand he has been given top secret clearance.

Case No. 80. This individual is a chief in the Division of International Labor. The Department's investigative agency indicates receipt of information in October 1946, to the effect that this individual was a member of at least one Communist-front organization and is a fellow traveler. He, however, still retains his position in the State Department.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Wisconsin have a case No. 37 among the cases he is presenting?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot tell at the moment, because the reporters for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been using some of my papers. But I assume I had a case No. 37.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wondered why the Senator took them out of order. Is there any reason why he did not take them in order, beginning with No. 1, and going down through them?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did take them in order.

I get the impression that the Senator may have a file of his own, and apparently I do not have the same cases he has. I am very glad to know the Senator has, if that is the answer. However, I have taken them in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, some of the papers have just been returned to my desk; and if I may do so, I shall give the Senator from Michigan the information that I do have a case No. 37.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator does?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I see it?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Next, Mr. President, I come to case No. 81. I think this individual has been doing this Nation untold damage because of the high position she holds in the Voice of America. This individual was in the Voice of America project, in the New York office, until some time ago. She was transferred to Europe, technically under control of the Commanding General, in the same type of work as the Voice of America, and subsequently the entire project was transferred back to the State Department, and she is today in the State Department.

I should like to read this material. Incidentally, this is the last case we have.

The file in this case contains a wealth of information indicating that this individual is an extremely dangerous and active Communist, completely disloyal to the United States, and loyal to Soviet Russia. Much of the information here, however, was given in strictest confidence but I shall try to give somewhat of a picture of this person.

It is perhaps sufficient to point out that the witnesses without exception have stated in essence that this individual has collected in her office a mixture of fellow travelers and pseudo liberals and outright Communists. These witnesses indicate that the group is close knit and attempts a vicious character assassination of anyone who attempts to disagree with them, and apparently rather successfully so.

All this information comes from the files of the investigative agency, and, as I have just said, shows that the witnesses indicate that the group is close knit and attempts a vicious character assassination job of anyone who attempts to disagree with them.

The witnesses without exception seem to feel that this individual has exerted a great deal of control over the information used on the Voice of America, and is doing the United States immeasurable damage.

I understand that this individual is now in Europe, and, although technically under the control of the Army, is in effect, to all intents and purposes, under the control of the State Department, and is still doing the same work as that involved in the Voice of America, formerly worked on in New York.

Mr. President, since this paper was dictated night before last I find that she is back in the State Department.

Immediate steps should be taken, in my opinion, to obtain not only the discharge but the prosecution of this individual.

Mr. President, I may also say that I feel very strongly that cases Nos. 1, 2, and

81 should not only be discharged but should be immediately prosecuted. However, unless the President will cooperate with us in that, the possibility of a successful prosecution is rather remote, because of the complete iron curtain of secrecy.

I wish to thank very much the Senators who very patiently have remained here and have listened to what may have been somewhat tedious during the last 8 hours.

I assure them that I tried to keep my remarks as brief as possible, while at the same time giving Senators all the pertinent information from the files.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment, and then I shall move that the Senate take a recess.

I do not know whether the newspaper clippings which have come over my desk are correct or incorrect. However, I know that the reporters for the wire services and other reporters for various newspapers who heard the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in his latest tour across the country have reported many things he said which alarmed me, to say the least.

When the Senator from Wisconsin was at Wheeling, W. Va., the newspapers reported that the Senator declared he had a list of 205 persons working for the State Department, who were known to the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party. When I read that statement I was shocked, and alarmed, as I had a right to be. It seemed to me that if the Senator from Wisconsin had a list of 205 persons whom he knew to be working in the State Department, and he waited to go on a Republican tour in West Virginia in order to tell the people of the country the fact, it seemed to me to be slightly out of order. If he had the information, he should have reported it directly to the Secretary of State or to a committee of the Senate of the United States.

Not satisfied with that, in Reno, Nev., when he was making another political speech, the Senator from Wisconsin said he had compiled a list of 57 Communists in the State Department. Later, in another speech, he named four individuals, three of whom, I understand, have not been with the Department for some time, one of whom was never with the State Department. In that statement the Senator from Wisconsin said he hastened to say he did not charge any one of the four with being a Communist.

Mr. President, the only thing the Senator from Illinois has been attempting to get, and it is information, which the Senate and the country are entitled to have—is a statement of the names of these individuals in the State Department, and to get the names as fast as possible, in order to clear up any cloud that may be hovering over every member of the State Department at this very moment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has done an injustice to members of the State Department who are loyal and patriotic, and who are attempting to carry on in the great world crisis in which we find ourselves. Instead of doing so on a political tour, it would have been much better and much more in keeping with the best interest of the Nation, had the Senator submitted the names directly to a committee of the Senate or to the State Department, instead of making political propaganda out of it from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois can speak for the majority party in saying there is not a single Member on this side of the aisle who is not as much interested as is the Senator from Wisconsin in determining where Communists rest, if there are any within the Government departments, and we will do the very thing the Senator is requesting. I guarantee him that a committee will be formed at once, and the Senator from Wisconsin will have an opportunity to come before the committee to tell who these persons are. Before the committee, he will not be able to hide behind numbers. He will have to tell the facts and disclose the names of the persons within the State Department who are Communists. It ought to be done, Mr. President. If such charges can be made against a group in the State Department, without naming them, they can be made against almost any group in any department. Therefore, in view of what the Senator has said upon his political tour over the country, and in view of what he has said on the floor of the Senate tonight, it becomes absolutely necessary to clear this matter up as soon as possible.

So far as I am concerned, if, as the Senator said in his Wheeling, W. Va., speech, if the press quoted him correctly, there is a single person in the Department carrying a Communist card, the Senator from Illinois wants to know about it, and every other Senator wants to know about it. We shall find out. We shall not find out by innuendo and by half truths and distorted facts. The facts, if there are facts, will be produced. We shall not go around talking about No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and so on to No. 83.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say at this time. I repeat what I said in the beginning, that all the Senator from Illinois was trying to find out was as to who the persons in question are. I think the Senate and the country are entitled to know as speedily as possible just who in the State Department is being charged with being a Communist. If the facts produced show that the persons on the list are Communists, the Senator knows that the President of the United States, as well as the Senator from Illinois and every other Member on this side of the aisle will not rest until such Communists are discharged from office. Moreover, if there have been any traitorous acts either of espionage or anything else connected with it, having in mind the numbers the Senator has given us, they, too, will probably be ferreted out.

But, Mr. President, to assert that 205 persons are card carriers of the Communist Party, or that even 87 are card carriers, is to reflect seriously upon the FBI. The FBI knows practically every Communist card carrier in this country. I say the President of the United States and the FBI would not knowingly permit such a card carrier to remain in any Government department. If they would, I should want to find out about it myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we beseech Thee that in this Brotherhood Week our moments of prayer may be radiant with clear visions of high and helpful things that we are privileged to do together for the welfare of humanity.

We believe in no man's infallibility of wisdom and judgment, and may we therefore accept the Master's overtures of counsel in the noble adventure of building a social order which is truly Christian.

Grant that, as brothers of the Son of Man, our minds and hearts may be impervious to those attitudes and feelings which are alien to the spirit of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 16, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 229):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

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

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] may have an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.