SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 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, for another day, for another morning, for another chance to serve this troubled age, we are truly thankful. We beseech Thee this day to free us from fear of the future, from bitterness toward our fellows, from cowardice in face of danger, from failure before opportunity, from weakness when Thy power is available. Fill us with love that knows no barrier of race or class, with courage that cannot be shaken, with faith strong enough for the darkness, with strength sufficient for our tasks, with wisdom to meet life's complexities, with loyalty to Thy kingdom's goal. In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 2, 1950, was dispensed with.

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 the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. LONG, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Classification of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], under a unanimous-consent agreement entered into last night, is entitled to the floor at this time to complete his unfinished remarks of last evening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I will yield for that purpose, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. 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	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	O'Conor
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Darby	Knowland	Stennis
Donnell	Langer	Taft
Douglas	Leahy	Taylor
Downey	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Long	Tobey
Ellender	Lucas	Tydings
Ferguson	McCarran	Watkins
Flanders	McCarthy	Wherry
Frear	McClellan	Wiley
Fulbright	McKellar	Williams
George	McMahon	Withers
Green	Magnuson	
Gurney	Malone	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is entitled to the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so I may make a unanimous-consent request for consideration of routine business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, so long as my right to the floor is not jeopardized thereby.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit matters for the RECORD, without debate.

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

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 143)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, which, with the accompanying statement, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL AID TO CITIES UNDER FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the continuation of Federal aid to cities under the Federal Aid Highway Act.

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

Resolution requesting Congress to continue the annual aid to cities under the Federal Aid Highway Act

Whereas cities have been receiving $112,500,000 annually under the Federal Aid Highway Act; and

Whereas a bill has just been introduced to continue this aid; and

Whereas relying on this aid, the city of Minneapolis has entered into a program involving the construction and improvement of streets, highways, and bridges in the city of Minneapolis; and

Whereas it is imperative, in order that the city may proceed with this program, that Federal aid be continued; and

Whereas one of the most important projects which is now being undertaken and constructed, relying upon substantial Federal aid, is the grade separation program in south Minneapolis, which involves the condemnation of property and the removal of several grade crossings in said city; and

Whereas this grade separation has been needed for 70 years; and

Whereas this grade separation would never have been undertaken had it not been that the city and the railroad company affected relied upon a continuance of Federal aid; and

Whereas this project is now under way and, if it cannot be completed, the city of Minneapolis and the railroad company will be in a worse position than if it had never been undertaken; and

Whereas this project cannot be continued and completed unless Federal aid under the Federal Aid Highway Act is made continuously available; and

Whereas many other projects in the city of Minneapolis involving the construction and improvement of Federal routes on streets, highways, and bridges, in the city of Minneapolis, which are of critical importance in the proper defense of the United States, are dependent on the continuation of this aid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That it urgently requests the continuation of this Federal aid in an annual amount of not less than $112,500,000; be it further

Resolved, That the city engineer of the city of Minneapolis be authorized to present this resolution to the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, or any

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

other committee which may investigate this matter; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of Congress from the city of Minneapolis, or any congressional district of which the city of Minneapolis is a part.

Passed February 24, 1950.

C. L. SWANSON,
President of the Council.

Approved February 27, 1950.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

CHAS. C. SWANSON,
City Clerk.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—PETITIONS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a telegram from the National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L., signed by H. L. Mitchell, president, and a letter from Anna Lord Strauss, president of the League of Women Voters, of Washington, D. C., endorsing the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by me on behalf of myself and other Senators, to House bill 4567, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1950.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L., fully endorses provisions substitute bill offered to liberalize Displaced Persons Act of 1948 in line with policy of American Federation of Labor on this subject.

H. L. MITCHELL,
President, National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1950.

The Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The League of Women Voters has for several years been active in support of legislation which would represent a bona fide effort on the part of the United States in helping to solve the displaced-persons problem.

We are gratified to see that you and a large bipartisan group of Senators have proposed an amendment to H. R. 4567, in the nature of a substitute. In our opinion this amendment is deserving of full support. If adopted, we believe it will result in a constructive step by our country in contributing to the final solution of this issue.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA LORD STRAUSS,
President.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3170. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the construction of a water and sewage disposal system for the village of Sanish, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 3171. A bill for the relief of Mehdi Omana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 3172. A bill for the relief of Warren C. Baggett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3173. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to undertake a project under the Federal Airport Act for the development and improvement of Chatham Field at Savannah, Ga., during the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3174. A bill for the relief of Theodora Dovalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3175. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 3176. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3177. A bill for the relief of Franco Contanzo (also known as James Scotto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 3178, to restore national coal production, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3179. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LEAHY (by request):

S. 3180. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. MYERS) introduced Senate bill 3181, to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL RENT CONTROL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by the Senator from Pennsylvania together with a letter and two telegrams be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, introduced by Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. MYERS), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement, letter, and telegrams referred to are as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS ON BILL TO EXTEND FEDERAL RENT CONTROL TO JULY 1, 1951

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, a bill is being submitted today, jointly sponsored by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and myself, which proposes to continue Federal rent control for a year beyond the present July 1, 1950, expiration date of the rent-control law adopted by the Eighty-first Congress last March.

I am satisfied that every Member of Congress is by now aware of the instant public reaction to the interpretation made February 25 of this year that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate had voted, in effect, only the funds needed to wind up the affairs of the Housing Expediter by the end of this coming June.

In the short time which has elapsed since that announcement I have received a great deal of mail, not only from Pennsylvania, but from people all over the country, telling me that the removal of Federal rent controls in their communities at this time would result in calamity because their housing shortages have not yet been licked.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, that we must continue rent controls at least through the middle of 1951. I'm not happy about this. I am sure no Member of Congress supports rent control simply for the sake of control itself. But, Mr. President, difficult as it is to draw up—and hard as it is to administer—a rent-control law, I honestly believe, that the act we adopted in the last session of Congress has worked well, and with a minimum inconvenience to everybody involved.

I have intended for some time to submit a bill proposing rent-control extension, but frankly, I have refrained from doing so up to now because I realized that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over rent-control legislation, has been extremely busy working on the middle-income housing bill and other important legislation.

So I've been hesitant about interrupting this important work because the real solution to the rent-control problem lies in ending the housing shortage, and the middle-income bill represents the kind of program which will help us tremendously in filling our housing needs.

The rent-control law of 1949 is not due to expire for almost four more months, and I had felt that the Banking and Currency Committee would have found adequate time to study the rent-control problem and come up with the facts after we had completed our work on middle-income housing.

However, in light of the question which has been raised by the action of the Appropriations Committee, I feel now that the Banking and Currency Committee should undertake as soon as possible to get its hearings started on rent control, because I am convinced that the facts will incontestably show that the law must go on beyond the middle of this year. I have consulted with the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senator MAYBANK, and he will take up the whole matter of hearings at the committee meeting next Tuesday, March 7.

I believe that we have a way right now of proving the need for rent-control extension. The rent control law we adopted last year, as you recall, contained a local option provision which permitted people in any particular area to decontrol their rents locally when it was felt that controls were no longer needed. Most communities, most States, have not chosen to lift controls even though the law made it readily possible for them to do so. I am satisfied that this failure to exercise the local-option provision is a convincing demonstration that the housing shortage is still acute in entirely too many places.

We have seen too, I regret to say, what has happened in the communities that have lifted their rent controls prematurely. Rents in those communities have risen. Not all of the rents have gone up, it is true. But there are still landlords—not many landlords, but a few, who spoil things for everyone—who will

sky-rocket their rents and indulge in rent-gouging when they know their tenants can find no other place to live.

I want the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. President, to look into this. I want the committee to give us the facts about the need for rent control. As I say, I am satisfied that the facts produced will show that rent controls will have to go on for a time longer, at least.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to submit at this time just a few of the communications I have received as evidence of the still present need for control.

BALA-CYNWYD, PA., *February 27, 1950.*

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The news, that the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended the termination of all rent controls on June 30, is alarming.

Recently the results of a housing survey were published. They showed that while much progress has been made in the building of homes and apartments, rentals are far beyond the means of the pensioned and low-income groups. I am an office worker.

In the 4 years I have occupied this apartment my rent has been increased three times, a total of $21. In addition, I was forced to personally replace antiquated and inadequate equipment in order to have constant and satisfactory refrigeration.

Leases are being continued on a month to month basis in anticipation of the lifting of rent controls.

It is desirable to end Government controls as soon as possible, but the indications are that some form of policing is still necessary in this particular field to prevent undue hardship, and I respectfully request your consideration of the two mentioned groups when the committee's action comes up for Senate approval.

Very truly yours,
(Miss) HAZEL MCCREA.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *February 27, 1950.*

Senator FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully solicit your vote and influence to oppose any legislation designed to remove rent controls.

Respectfully,
L. W. GRAHAM,
Recording Secretary, Local 2632,
United Steel Workers of America.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 28, 1950.*

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your reading the following telegram to the Members of the United States Senate to insure inclusion in the record:

"Protest action of Senate Appropriations Committee in eliminating the supplemental appropriation for the Housing Expediter's office. This is legislation by appropriation and was calculated to prejudge and influence future congressional action on rent control. If the reduced appropriation stands, effective enforcement of rent control will end now instead of June 30 as voted by Congress. Neighborhood workers know a crisis in housing still exists for the great mass of wage earners. High rental houses may be available but not shelter for the low-income groups. Members of Congress know the tragic experience in decontrolled areas where rents have been increased nearly 40 percent on housing units priced $30 a month or less. We urge the Senate to make the full supplemental appropriations and continue rent control until American families are in a bargaining position in relation to housing and are assured of a roof over their heads.

"Committee on social education and action, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. Francis Bosworth, Chairman."

This represents what I know to be true in Philadelphia as well as in settlement neighborhoods throughout Pennsylvania and the Nation.

FRIENDS' NEIGHBORHOOD GUILD.
FRANCIS BOSWORTH.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and other Senators), to House bill 4567, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE IN BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I serve notice on the Senate and those interested that on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 2826) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is substantially the same amendment which I proposed last year to the agricultural bill relating to reciprocal trade agreements and the importation from other countries of agricultural products on which we have price supports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SURVEY OF ECA IN EUROPE BY SENATOR MCCARRAN (S. DOC. NO. 141)

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, I have presented a survey of the ECA in Europe to the joint committee, and am authorized by the joint committee to ask unanimous consent that the survey may be printed as a Senate document. I send the survey to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document. I have conferred with the Parliamentarian respecting it, and I am advised that it complies with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANALYSIS OF ECA PROGRAM (S. DOC. NO. 142)

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, the staff of the Joint Committee on Economic Cooperation, of which committee I have the honor to be chairman, presented to the committee an analysis of the ECA program, and I am authorized by the joint committee to ask unanimous consent to have it printed as a Senate document. I now ask unanimous consent that the analysis may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WHERE SHOULD ECA GO FROM HERE?—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my own statement of explanation, entitled "Where Should ECA Go From Here?" may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

WHERE SHOULD ECA GO FROM HERE?

STATEMENT OF SENATOR M'CARRAN

One of the major problems facing the Senate and the Congress this year is the determination of what action to take with regard to the continuation of our Foreign Assistance Act. Let me hasten to say that it is not a question of whether or not the ECA should continue, and let me express the opinion, also, that it is not simply a question of determining how much money the ECA should get.

The foreign assistance program was inaugurated because there existed certain fundamental problems and maladjustments in Europe which, we believed, if left alone would result in danger to the United States. Statistical evidence, confirmed by my own observation during the 3 months I spent in Europe last fall, indicates that conditions have improved since April 3, 1948, and Europe is a more comfortable place to be in than it was at the end of the war. A report on my trip to Europe has been submitted to the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic cooperation, of which I am the chairman, and is being issued as a Senate document. Nevertheless, I doubt whether anyone today believes that in the case of any of the basic problems and maladjustments with which Europe is confronted, the solution has been found and the work done. The iron curtain still cuts off western Europe from the foodstuffs and raw materials which it formerly obtained from the east and prevents it from selling its manufactures in southeastern Europe. The economy of western Europe has not yet been made over to adjust for these fundamental changes. Furthermore, in certain countries, governments friendly to us are still in constant danger of overthrow by the Communists, and there is no question but that the mass of the people of Europe suffer from poverty and deprivation which it is difficult for Americans to realize.

Under the circumstances I am firmly convinced that to stop economic aid now would involve the loss of much that we have gained in Europe so far, and bring on a crisis comparable to that existing when Secretary of State Marshall made his address at Harvard in June 1947.

When I say that we must consider where ECA should go from here, I do not mean that the primary problem is determining the amount of money to be appropriated. Before we can do that, it is necessary for us to consider whether the ECA operation to date is bringing us to the goals we had in mind at its outset and, what is perhaps more important, do we find in 1950 that the job to be done in Europe is somewhat different than we conceived it to be in 1947 and 1948.

Let me emphasize that there has not been before, nor will there be again, so favorable an opportunity for a searching examination of the ECA program. Industrial production

in Europe has passed the prewar levels. Agricultural production is approaching prewar volume. It is no longer necessary to concentrate primarily on keeping the patient alive. We have time now to consider whether our course of treatment is really getting the patient back on his feet.

We should examine the lessons to be learned from the nearly 2 years of experience with ECA operations. We should recognize that since ECA began, our foreign policy has been broadened and our objectives in Europe have been made more concrete by our adherence to the North Atlantic Treaty. It is high time for us to consider where we want to go and what changes in our approach to the problem are desirable.

With this situation in mind, I set the staff of the watchdog committee to work on this problem. I said to them, "You have been studying the ECA operation for nearly 2 years and have visited all of the participating countries. Give me a report indicating the principal things that you feel should be done about the ECA program now." Such a report has been prepared which is passed on to the Members of the Congress by the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, not as an expression of the committee's views, but rather as an informative and provocative document which will be helpful in considering the various aspects of economic assistance to Europe with which we are confronted.

The report does not indicate that the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 should be substantially done over. It concentrates on seven aspects of the ECA program which require detailed study at present, and suggests five legislative changes. I would like to call your attention to some of the larger issues that are involved.

Perhaps the first thing we should look at is the economic integration or unification of Europe. The Foreign Assistance Act from the very beginning recognized the advantages to the countries of Europe of making Europe into one big market. No American can question the fact that a Europe in which factories were located in areas of greatest natural advantage, if given the benefits of a vast mass consumers market, would be able to take advantage of mass production methods and would thus increase output far beyond its present potential. The present industrial pattern is based on vertical nationalistic economies with industries propped up and protected to keep them going regardless of their inherent economic disadvantages.

Let us look at the postwar record of one basic industry, for example, the European steel industry. The ECA had at the end of 1949 authorized the expenditure of $167,000,000 on European steel mill projects. No one can question that the European steel industry needs new equipment and that a lot of this equipment can be obtained only in the United States.

I am told that the most revolutionary development in steel manufacturing during the last half century has been the continuous strip mill. This machine originated in the United States and permits the rolling of steel sheets in very large quantities at very low costs, and is used by all of the important American sheet producers today.

In Europe at the beginning of the war there were only two such mills—one in England and one in Germany. The mill in Germany has since been shipped to Russia as reparations. It is pretty generally agreed that no one can compete in the manufacture of steel sheets today without a continuous mill. It is quite natural then that all of the steel-producing countries of Europe showed a great interest in building continuous mills as soon as the war was over.

The ECA has allocated $137,000,000 to seven corporations in six European countries which include such mills in their reconstruction projects. The continuous mills themselves cost less than this amount. None of these mills is yet completed and some will not be in operation for 2 or 3 years.

I call your attention particularly to the places in which these plants are being built with our dollars:

Austria, one plant	$10,000,000
Belgium, one plant	2,000,000
France, two plants	61,000,000
Italy, one plant	12,000,000
Netherlands, one plant	23,000,000
United Kingdom, one plant	27,000,000

Let us see if this distribution of American dollars appears to conform to a policy of promoting the industrial integration of Europe.

We know that steel production is a large-scale operation and that costs of coal and iron ore and the availability of water transportation should be the determining factors in the location of plants. We should expect to see steel production in the new Europe, which we are financing, concentrated in factories of the most economical size in the locations with the greatest natural advantages.

I call your attention particularly to the fact that not one of these continuous mills is being built in Germany, which is generally regarded as having greater natural advantages for steel manufacture than any location in Europe. That means that the Ruhr, where steel sheets could presumably be produced more cheaply than any place else in Europe, will be kept out of this important branch of production because it will be unable to compete without a continuous mill. If European producers of machinery, electrical equipment, and other manufactured goods are to regain their place in the markets of the world, it will be necessary for them to have access to steel sheets at the minimum possible cost. If sheet costs are kept higher than necessary for any reason, not only will the steel industry of Europe suffer, but her technical, engineering, and precision industries generally, in which she has always been preeminent, will be handicapped.

On the other hand, it is necessary to recognize that every major power in Europe regards the possession of steel-manufacturing facilities within its borders as essential to its national defense. Consequently, the fact that Austria, for example, has had a steel industry for 100 years does not prove that Austria is a good place in which to manufacture steel. Her industry got its start under the Hapsburgs, when Austria was still a major military power. Italy expanded her steel-producing capacity under Mussolini for military reasons. It does not follow that Italy's steel plants should be rebuilt with new machinery in an effort to enable them to compete with England, France, and Austria.

It is generally agreed that Europe does not need any additional steel-rolling capacity beyond that already authorized.

We find ourselves, then, at the end of 2 years of ECA operation in a situation where we have invested all the dollars that should be invested in European steel production for the time being, and facing the fact that much of this investment has not advanced the economic unification of Europe. It has, in fact, probably impeded such unification. All of these continuous mills are large, all are being built with Government sanction and most with substantial Government financing. Each gives employment to large numbers of people. It is difficult to conceive that an Austrian Government would permit rolled-steel products to be imported into Austria because they could be bought more cheaply than they could be made at home, while Austrian steel workmen were unemployed and while its fine new factories stood idle. It is inevitable that once these factories are built, the governments which have sponsored them will be driven to imposing trade barriers and providing subsidies to keep them going.

I do not say that the money we have spent for building these rolling mills is wasted or charge the ECA with bad administration because these expenditures have been approved. The reason why these plants have been authorized is that the ECA has been confronted with short-run, national, political situations which had to be given priority over long-run considerations of economic unification. You could not ask a government which was maintaining itself by only a few votes over the Communist opposition to make decisions which would lay it open to charges that it was not doing everything possible to build up an industry which provided employment, was necessary for national defense, and in which national pride and prestige were involved.

My point is that if we are to make substantial progress toward the unification of European industry we will have to make a change in our approach. Consider for a few moments the problem of bringing about a transformation of European industry so that production for the entire market would be concentrated in plants of the most efficient size grouped at the lowest cost locations.

There are two possible alternatives for achieving greater unification. One way would be to formulate a sort of master plan based on detailed engineering studies of cost factors for the major industries for various possible locations. Such a plan should indicate that the steel plants should be here and here, the rayon plants there and there, the automobile factories at certain locations, and so on.

Such a task is a formidable one; many regard it as hopeless; but let me emphasize that if it is to work the factories must ultimately be located at the most efficient locations, regardless of national interests, for otherwise Europe will remain a high-cost producer, unable to compete with the United States and the new manufacturing industries of Latin-America and Asia.

The other and more desirable way of getting the desired integration would be to remove all restrictions on the movement of goods and capital across the national borders of Europe and eliminate all subsidies and supports which governments give to their industries. Then factories would be built by private managers in the lowest-cost places without the necessity for prior development of a master plan.

The important thing is that whichever approach is made there has to be some sort of government for western Europe superior to the individual national governments which can enforce decisions which particular countries will find unpalatable.

Unless this is done I do not believe the economic integration of Europe can ever be brought about. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), which is the existing organization of the Marshall plan countries in Europe, will never be able to do this job. Its responsibilities are definitely limited to the economic field and its actions must be unanimous. Issues which involve national security or transcend internal political interests of one of its member governments are not left for it to decide. Moreover, even the issues which it does decide are the result of careful compromises to which unanimous consent can be obtained. Each nation is under strong pressure to vote for every other's projects for fear that its own programs may be blackballed if it is too critical.

In any event, it is clear that the amount of money which the Congress appropriates for the ECA is not the factor which will determine the extent of economic unification that will be achieved during the next fiscal year. The determining factor will be the adoption of an approach designed to accomplish the end desired, and then to take the political and organizational steps that will make the program possible. Unless these things are done, an appropriation of United

States dollars comparable in amount to what we have given in the past 2 years will actually, in my opinion, retard economic integration rather than advance it.

It is necessary to recognize, however, that we should offer an incentive to the countries of Europe to integrate their economies. One way to accomplish this objective would be to set up a corporation comparable to the RFC, with Marshall plan countries represented on its board, but with the United States having the majority control as long as we put up most of the money. Such a corporation could deal directly with European businessmen who wished financial aid for industrial development, but it would establish certain standards to insure that each project would promote the integration of European industry. An appropriation could be made to provide capital to this corporation. The capital would be replenished as the need arose, but there would be no invitation to divide it up among the countries and spend it the first year. It would be used only as satisfactory projects were approved. No factories would be constructed as part of an annual national program. Only propositions which could pass a careful screening as to their soundness from the point of view of the western European economy as a whole would be financed.

It is unlikely that many projects meeting such standards would be ready the first year. This would not retard European recovery for, let me remind you, European industry has already exceeded its prewar level of output and we are justified in extreme caution in the approval of further industrial expansion.

I would like to mention briefly certain other aspects of the ECA program where the results have fallen somewhat short of the hopes that were envisaged at the beginning.

First is the matter of encouraging American private investors to supply capital and managerial assistance to European industry. During the first year of the ECA, $300,000,000 were available to guarantee the convertibility into dollars of private American investments in the participating countries, and for the current fiscal year $150,000,000 are available. Nevertheless, as of last December 31 there had been, during the entire life of the ECA, a total of 15 such guaranties made, amounting to less than $4,000,000. It seems clear that a new and different approach in this field is necessary if private investment is to be encouraged to take its legitimate part in the industrial future of Europe.

The risks encountered in foreign investment during a period of cold war are great. As European recovery becomes less a matter of feeding the hungry and more a problem of building an efficient economic machine, the advantages to be derived from increasing the participation of American private capital becomes more and more apparent. Certainly we should give every careful thought to the possibility of strengthening our guarantee provisions to see if some real progress cannot be made in this direction.

I have a feeling also that not enough thought has yet been given to certain man-made obstacles to private investment, where the principal factor is the decision of the United States as to precisely how far it wants to go. I refer particularly to the situation which exists in several Marshall plan countries where a major, although in most cases not the controlling, political party favors public ownership of basic industries. In such instances, there is strong resistance to any effort to American businessmen to invest in a country for fear that if American owners get a foothold it may handicap the public ownership program. As a result of this situation, there has been some feeling that our own State Department has been reluctant to push American interests aggressively for fear of antagonizing important political groups in participating countries.

We should not obligate the United States Treasury to guarantee private investments abroad until we are sure we want such investments and that the legal obstacles have been cleared away.

I believe the Congress should give further attention to the matter of obtaining strategic materials from the ECA countries. I think we will all agree that the provisions of Public Law 472, as amended, and that the discussions in this Chamber prior to the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act clearly indicated that the United States Congress expected that as we assisted Europe with our dollars and commodities, Europe would help us to get certain critical materials vital to our security. There was no idea, I think, that these materials would be supplied in sufficient volume to compensate for our aid. It was rather a belief that all of us were contributing to a common cause; that the United States was vulnerable as to certain materials, partly because we had depleted our supplies during the war and partly because we did not possess certain items which are vital to our industry; and that consequently Europe should help us to overcome our most serious weakness.

The ECA itself reports that progress in this field "has been slower than anticipated." Certainly the results are meager. We have obtained a little over $48,000,000 of such materials in nearly 2 years, and we have invested just over $6,000,000 in overseas projects for expanding the production of these materials.

I believe that the major difficulty here lies outside the ECA. It seems to me that the executive branch has never been able to decide just what we wanted to do in this field. Military stock piling is not the entire objective, and there has never been developed a broad, coordinated program which indicated just what ECA should try to obtain.

It is doubtful if our future supplies of certain commodities can be assured if the matter is regarded as strictly a commercial problem. The countries which control strategic material supplies think of them as giving them advantages in international political bargaining. The ECA gives us an unprecedented opportunity to negotiate effectively for what we need. The issues are complex, but the first step is to determine what we really want.

The investigations by the "watchdog committee" staff, as well as a survey by the Department of Commerce, indicate that our control of trade between the ECA countries and the area behind the iron curtain is not satisfactory. The biggest single difficulty is that most of the countries of western Europe which receive our aid have not accepted in its entirety our list of prohibited and restricted commodities. Today American firms are being denied export licenses for shipments to Russia and her satellites which competing firms in Belgium, the United Kingdom, or Germany are free to accept. Certainly, before we embark on a third year of ECA, this situation should be straightened out.

One aspect of the ECA program about which I have always had a sort of uncomfortable feeling is the effect of our present policies on our future exports, particularly our exports of farm products. There can be no question, it seems to me, but that our foreign-aid program has helped American exports and has helped the American farmer. If the imports of western Europe from the United States had been confined during the last 2 years to the quantities that could be paid for by that area with its own money, the volume supplied by us would have, indeed, been small.

I am aware also of the argument that in the long run the ECA program, if it succeeds, will benefit the American farmer and the American exporter, because a prosperous Europe with a high standard of living will be a better customer than a pauperized area living at the subsistence level.

The thing that bothers me, however, is the fact that the way the ECA program operates, it puts constant pressure on the countries of Europe to buy as much of everything outside the United States as possible. Take cotton, for example. During 1949 the ECA allocated $575,000,000 to the purchase of cotton. In justifying its appropriation request, the ECA estimated the requirements of Europe for cotton, wheat, copper, and other commodities. The appropriation is not earmarked, however, to purchase the estimated amounts of these products. Once the country gets its total allocation of United States dollars, it has every incentive to buy everything it can from a nondollar source. If a country can get more cotton from Egypt or India than it originally planned, so that it can use fewer dollars to buy American cotton, it can spend the dollars thus saved to buy something else. Furthermore, stress is continually being laid by the ECA, and by the European countries, too, on the fact that the way to close the dollar gap is to develop nondollar sources for as many of Europe's requirements as is possible.

This puts us in a position with regard to our farm price-support program where we are spending the United States taxpayers' dollars on the one hand to maintain an exportable surplus of cotton, and on the other hand to stimulate cotton production in Egypt and India so that Europe can be supplied from nondollar sources. It does not seem to me that we should be doing both of these things at the same time.

We must take a realistic view of the situation. If it is to be the United States policy in the future to maintain a volume of production of certain agricultural crops which is larger than our home market can absorb, and to hold the prices of these crops above the world-market level, then we should maintain for ourselves an appropriate share of the European market for our exports of these crops. Every year that we give Europe a bonus for buying as many agricultural products outside the United States as possible, we add to the future cost and complexity of our farm price-support program.

There is a relatively simple means available for correcting this situation. That is to offer as part of our foreign aid (in the past this has run to somewhere near 50 percent) bales of cotton, pounds of tobacco, bushels of wheat, et cetera, rather than dollars of equivalent amount. We could do this by appropriating funds to purchase designated quantities of these commodities in the United States to be apportioned among the countries of Europe in accordance with their requirements. These supplies would be just as helpful to the people of Europe as if they were procured in the old way, and we would eliminate the incentive to expand production of these items in nondollar areas.

Another most difficult problem confronting the Congress in connection with ECA is determining what its relation should be to our military commitments in Europe which have been entered into since the ECA was originally conceived and put into operation.

It seems to me that we cannot escape the conclusion that our relationship with, and our responsibilities toward, the countries of western Europe are substantially different in 1950 than they were in 1948 when the ECA began. Our position when the recovery program was inaugurated was comparable to that of a neighbor helping out some families in the next block who had suffered a disaster. Our objective was to help them get back on their feet. We did not want to interfere in their internal affairs except to make sure that our money was prudently used. We felt that after 5 years we would be glad to have our neighbors go their own way. They were our friends and, on all basic principles, we were confident that we were in agreement.

I cannot escape a feeling that the North Atlantic Treaty changed all of this. We are no longer related merely as friendly neighbors to the countries of western Europe. We are now partners in a common undertaking. This common venture is more serious and more far reaching than any economic project. We have undertaken to develop with our partners a plan for mutual defense, and we expect to fight side by side if that unfortunate occasion should ever arise.

Under these circumstances, we must all face the question of whether or not we can maintain this military partnership and avoid an economic partnership, and whether we can continue our military partnership beyond 1952 and terminate our economic partnership at that time.

If we should conclude that we can keep our military relationships with western Europe and our economic relationships in separate compartments, then we must use extreme care to make sure that the ECA program is not put into a tight compartment. That is, we must not define its objectives so narrowly or impose such restrictions on the disbursement of its funds that it tends to become an end in itself and grinds on like an automaton as long as the money lasts, regardless of how we are getting along with our over-all program of foreign relations.

Our experience with ECA operation in the past does not give us much reassurance on this point. At the present time, there are a number of instances where countries receiving our aid are refusing or delaying action on such matters as negotiating a trade treaty or removing discriminations against American businessmen. When such matters are brought to the attention of the ECA and the Department of State, the reply is generally to the effect that issues which are not definitely part of the recovery program cannot be allowed to interfere with that program.

It seems to me that we should make the adjustments in the ECA operation necessary to insure that a country cannot get money from us when it cooperates in compartment A but refuses to cooperate in compartment B.

Let me emphasize that I think that this new role of the ECA in our foreign relations, although it does not make its job less difficult, does tend to make its job less expensive. The ECA is no longer the whole team; it is now one player on a larger team. In certain cases, economic aid may be less vital to a country if it can be assured of our military backing.

It should be borne in mind that ECA in the beginning, in addition to providing food, fuel, and materials to the countries of western Europe, also made an important psychological contribution. It was the symbol to all that the countries of western Europe were not to be left alone and that the United States was concerned with their future.

Since the North Atlantic Treaty, the performance of this psychological function can be shifted from the shoulders of ECA. Our willingness to participate in a defense program for western Europe gives adequate assurance to our friends that we are behind them and puts potential aggressors on notice as to our objectives.

In more concrete terms, before our adherence to the North Atlantic Treaty, it would have been exceedingly difficult to cut off aid to any participating country even though its economic status was much improved, without causing an antagonistic reaction on the part of the country involved. Now the value of the United States military backing should assure continued cooperation of countries which may become capable of sustaining themselves without United States economic aid.

This discussion is limited to presenting certain fundamental issues with which we are concerned as we prepare to act on the ECA program for next year. The final point I want to make is that we can do much to solve many of the problems currently confronting ECA without writing a lot of specific legislation. This we can do by changing the basis on which the appropriation is authorized.

The two previous appropriations to the ECA have been based on the anticipated dollar deficits of the participating countries. This approach seems to me to have two fundamental disadvantages. First, the bigger a country's deficit, the more money it gets, so that there is a constant pressure on a country to maintain a deficit. Second, an allocation of United States dollars made on the basis of a deficit is necessarily inflexible. Even though the ECA screens a country's requirements very carefully, once an amount has been agreed upon as the necessary deficit, it is very difficult to make adjustments on the basis of the country's performance.

I believe that the ECA would do a better job and that the Congress would protect the interests of the American taxpayer more effectively if a program for spending United States money for foreign aid met the following tests:

1. The allocation of dollars to each country should be linked to specific, constructive courses of action rather than to the country's dollar deficit. A country which is making basic changes in its industrial structure, such as closing out a high-cost industry; which is undertaking a major revision of its tax structure, or which has removed many of its trade controls, might be assured of substantial United States aid as it progresses with these efforts.

2. Aid should be given in such a manner that the standard of living and general well-being of the country are primarily the responsibility of its own government—not of the United States.

The people of a country should feel that the decisions which determine how much they have to eat or how much is spent for road building, power development, or industrial reconstruction are made in Europe and not in Washington. A country should devote itself primarily to constructive, far-seeing action toward solving its basic problems rather than lobbying with OEEC, ECA, and other Government officials for more United States dollars.

One of the major shortcomings of the present method of distributing American aid is that it is too easy to place the blame for a reduction in the standard of living in a country on the United States. As long as appropriations are based on dollar deficits, this danger persists. If, after negotiation with the ECA and action by the United States Congress, a country gets fewer dollars than it had expected, its government will hold the United States responsible. We should make our assistance available in such a way that dollars are available to every country which can qualify for them. Then, the first responsibility is on the Government of each country to initiate a course of action which will entitle it to a share.

3. The aid program should be administered in such a manner as to minimize the incentive for a country to ask for more money than is necessary.

This objective can be approached, at least, if aid is allocated only to countries that undertake a program which involves some internal sacrifice. Under the present system, if a country lacks raw materials and machinery, we provide the money to buy these items and that country has every reason to ask for as much as possible. If, on the other hand, we say to a country which lacks raw materials and machinery that dollar assistance will be provided only if it will remove trade barriers, which protect one of its uneconomical industries, and will develop a program for shifting the laborers involved to other occupations, the Government of this country will have to give very serious study to the matter of its dollar request. To qualify for our money, the Government would have to arouse local antagonism and take political risks. Presumably, it would not ask for money unless the money really was needed and the sacrifices involved were worth while.

I suggest, therefore, that our next appropriation be authorized along the following lines:

Congress should authorize a definite sum to finance a European payments union. Such a union has been sponsored by the ECA and is now under discussion in Europe. I believe that a European clearing union would do more to stimulate intra-European trade than anything which has been tried so far. An appropriation under this authorization should be available only for this purpose.

I suggest also that a definite sum be authorized for the procurement of United States agricultural products to be supplied to Europe. This appropriation authorization would reserve for American farm products a commensurate place in the European market.

In addition, I believe the Congress should authorize a specified amount to provide capital to the international RFC, I have previously mentioned. This sum should be big enough to assure the countries of Europe that we are ready to underwrite any project which will really help to bring about an integrated European industry producing at the lowest possible cost. It should recognize also that until a new approach is made to this matter in Europe, very little money can be properly spent. Furthermore, the conditions under which this money can be spent should be laid down in the authorization for such a corporation.

I believe that it is essential that the Administrator of the ECA should be given a certain number of dollars to be spent for other programs. These could be economic or political or both. This does not mean that we should set up a $200,000,000 contingency fund, but that there be available to the Administrator a fund on which he could draw to finance such projects as the consummation of the Benelux Union if the United States believes it desirable to do so. At present, it appears that neither Belgium nor Holland is willing to take the final plunge because of the possible repercussions on their respective economies.

I want to emphasize that I am not advocating that the ECA be given a blank check. However, we have reached the stage in our foreign-assistance program where we do not protect the taxpayers' interest adequately if we give most of our attention to scrutinizing procurement programs for the individual participating countries. The thing that will determine whether or not our money is well spent is whether or not the countries that get our help take advantage of it to eliminate their fundamental weaknesses and embark on programs that will permit them to become strong and self-supporting.

I have already indicated that the ECA has already allocated $167,000,000 to rebuilding the European steel industry and that the results do not indicate that Europe will be fundamentally stronger as a result. Each of these expenditures was carefully screened by qualified experts. I am sure that we are getting a dollar's worth of machinery for every dollar we spend. From now on, it is not so much what commodities we buy as what the receiving nations do.

The way to protect the American taxpayer is for Congress to ask the ECA, "If we put so many dollars into Italy next year, what are the Italians going to do that will really strengthen their country?" Presumably, Italy needs major industrial, financial, and agricultural reforms if she is ever to pay her own way. She cannot accomplish

them overnight, but let us base our appropriation on a definite program of constructive action along these lines rather than upon a detailed analysis of how many bushels of wheat Italy will eat if we buy them for her.

The United States is playing for enormous stakes today. The threat of war ever hangs over us. We should use our influence, exert pressure, and spend money to strengthen our position and the positions of friendly nations against threatened aggression.

I believe that our Government should have a full kit of economic weapons available to it during the next year for its conduct of foreign affairs, in addition to our military resources. The purpose of the ECA appropriation is to provide our Government with this economic equipment. The first essential is to make sure that the economic devices we provide will really be effective.

The danger is that the ECA program will lack flexibility, that it will not be properly coordinated with our over-all objectives, and that it may persist in following a pattern set in the first 2 years of its operation which, in certain respects, no longer conforms to current realities.

Finally, let me say that I am firmly convinced that the success or failure of our economic-aid program will not be determined by whether we vote $3,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 or even $1,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. We can spend $3,000,000,000 and accomplish little except keep the people of Europe relatively tranquil while they wait for war to come. We can spend $1,000,000,000 to aid countries to carry forward significant programs for strengthening their economic structures and find that at the end of the year real progress will have been accomplished.

The success of the ECA from now on will depend on the wisdom with which the Congress determines what its job is and the skill with which the job is carried out.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

William B. Crawley, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Knox T. Hutchinson, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Elmer F. Kruse, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

Rolph S. Trigg, of New Mexico, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

Frank K. Woolley, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine before the Portland Lincoln Club, at Portland, Maine, February 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLISH FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR IVES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Polish freedom, delivered by Senator IVES, on the Justice for Poland program, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN BEFORE DINNER OF SOMERSET COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the annual dinner of the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce, at Somerset, Pa., on February 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOME OWNER AND HONEST MONEY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAIN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Association of Home Owners at Chicago, Ill., on February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONGRESS AND THE NATION'S HEALTH — ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Congress and the Nation's Health, delivered by him at the legislative conference of the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party in Minneapolis, Minn., February 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding the place of the United States in the affairs of the world, delivered by Senator JOHNSON of Texas at the breakfast of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N. J., February 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATIVE HOUSING LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY HERMAN T. STICHMAN

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Herman T. Stichman, New York State commissioner of housing, with regard to Senate bill 2246, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY GEORGE ERICSON

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Middle Income Group Housing Help Decried," written by George Ericson, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS POTATOES—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Bigger Hole," from the Wall Street Journal of February 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOUGLASS BURNETT, OF SPARKS, BALTIMORE COUNTY, MD.

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Jeffersonian, of Towson, Md., of February 24, 1950, relative to Douglass Burnett, of Sparks, Baltimore County, Md., recently elected president of the Edison Pioneers, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, with reference to a chapter in his semiannual report which deals with savings and economy. I also ask unanimous consent that chapter IV, Savings, Absorbed Costs, and Reductions, from the first semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense, which accompanies his letter, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and excerpt from the semiannual report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 28, 1950.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,[1]
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My first semiannual report to the Congress under the provisions of the National Security Act amendments of 1949 is now at the printer's and should be in your hands in bound-volume form in approximately 3 weeks.

In view of the time lag involved in the printing process, I am taking the liberty of transmitting herewith one of the chapters of the semiannual report—this being the chapter which deals with savings, absorbed costs, and reductions.

I am sending this chapter to you out of context in order to get it into your hands as promptly as possible. Since this is the chapter which deals with savings, its primary emphasis is, of course, upon the subject of economy. You will note that at the outset of the chapter the following statement appears: "Elsewhere in this report I have discussed the strengthening of our national security—for in all that we do security comes first, and economy comes second."

My purpose in quoting this sentence is to call your attention to the fact that the remainder of the report deals in detail with the various measures we have taken, and propose to take, in the interest of strengthening our national security.

The bound volume, which you will receive as soon as printing and binding can be completed, will consist of 10 chapters, together with accompanying reports of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. For your information the titles of the various chapters are as follows:

Chapter I. Introduction.
Chapter II. Mutual defense.
Chapter III. Unification.
Chapter IV. Savings, absorbed costs, and reductions.
Chapter V. Improvement in fiscal procedures.
Chapter VI. New weapons.
Chapter VII. Military research and development.
Chapter VIII. Industrial preparedness.
Chapter IX. Personnel.
Chapter X. Health.

It is my hope that the entire report will serve a useful purpose in terms of a more widespread knowledge concerning the things which the Department of Defense, with the assistance and cooperation we have received in such bountiful measure from the President and the Congress, is seeking to accomplish.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

IV. SAVINGS, ABSORBED COSTS, AND REDUCTIONS

During World War II a speedy victory, even at the expense of efficiency and economy, was the primary concern of the military services. We entered World War II without a unified Military Establishment. The costly

[1] Similar letters were sent to Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives; Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate; and Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

habits which grew up during that war, however, have no place in today's Military Establishment; nor do they have any place in the unified Military Establishment of the future, whether in peace or war.

The National Military Establishment, as it existed before the Congress created the Department of Defense on August 10, 1949, was still suffering from costly war-born spending habits. It was like a fat man—and, like a fat man, was in poor condition until the fat could be transformed into muscle.

In order that the newly created Department of Defense might be in condition of preparedness to accomplish our basic objective of maintaining the peace, or to fight a war if we should again be the victims of aggression, it was essential for us to eliminate the excess overhead and the unnecessary duplications and overlaps that had existed in the past.

Before the services could make effective use of their money, therefore, it was essential that they get in condition. Even if additional amounts of money had been added to their budget, large percentages of it would have failed to produce added military strength. It is the process of getting in condition which has been going on during the period covered by this report.

So much for preamble and simile. Elsewhere in this report I have discussed the strengthening of our national security, for in all that we do security comes first and economy comes second. In this chapter I shall discuss the vitally important subject of savings. In my view, it is mandatory that we effect savings in the Department of Defense. These are my reasons:

First, it is mandatory because of the urgent necessity of maintaining a healthy national economy—and, in order to maintain such an economy, our expenditures must be held to the lowest level compatible with our national security.

Second, it is mandatory because of the equally urgent necessity of making savings wherever possible in order to assure that money which would otherwise go into excessive overhead and waste can be used to increase our combat effectiveness.

In other words, savings are important in and of themselves because each dollar that we refrain from spending means a healthier national economy, but savings are equally important as a source of money with which we can buy more planes, more tanks, and more ships.

A particularly apt illustration of the second factor set out above was the recently announced decision to maintain an additional aircraft carrier during fiscal year 1951, with the cost of maintaining this additional carrier to be met out of savings elsewhere in the Naval Establishment. This is a graphic illustration of our plans for converting fat into muscle.

An illustration of the same general sort, with applicability to the Army, is this: As of the close of the period covered by this report, the Army had 4,400 more men in combat units than it had in such units on July 1, 1949. Much of this increase in combat effectiveness was made possible by savings in the use of undue numbers of personnel for administrative and overhead purposes. This 4,400 increase in the number of men in combat units is even more striking when it is borne in mind that the total number of men in the Army decreased by almost 20,00 men during this period.

Over all, the readiness of the Navy has been improved and the active fleet is ready to go. It is manned at 67 percent of wartime strength with trained personnel who seek to make a career of the Navy. This represents a substantial improvement over the situation 18 months ago when a larger active fleet in number of men and ships was manned at only 61 percent of wartime strength with many of the ships either immobilized or in a reduced operational status because of heavy turn-over of personnel and a serious imbalance in the skills and occupations represented.

In the case of the Air Force it is worth noting that on January 1, 1948, the Finletter Commission recommended 70 groups manned by 401,000 men. On that date the report also noted that the Air Force stood at 337,000 men for 55 programed groups. However, due to requirements for the radar screen, increased function taken over from the Army, and organizational changes in our bomber groups, 502,000 men would be needed today for the 70-group concept or its equivalent—the requirement for an authorized strength of 502,000 men was recognized by Congress in the Selective Service Act of 1948.

These organizational changes bring up a point which is worthy of comment, namely, the fact that the size of a group is subject to change. As President Truman has pointed out, "The number of groups is a somewhat misleading measure of airpower since the character, size, number of aircraft, and other elements of the group are not fixed but constantly change as conditions require." An example of the type of change to which the President referred is the programmed size of each B–36 Heavy Bombardment Group—which stood at 18 planes per group less than a year ago, and which stands at 30 planes per group today. In this connection it should also be noted that the programed size of nine groups which stood at 30 B–29's or B–50's per group 2 years ago, stands at 45 today. In addition, these groups include 20 B–29-type tankers which increase the effective range of each individual bomber.

In our Air Force of today and as planned for 1951, we have 416,000 men manning 48 groups, but due to the organizational changes noted above, these 48 groups, according to Air Force estimates, are equivalent to 52½ groups of the size envisaged in the previous concept of the 70-group program.

With respect to our over-all economy program, I have stated on a number of occasions that within a year after the amendments to the Unification Act, we expect to be effecting savings at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year. The target date is August 10, 1950. With more than 7 months remaining, I am glad to be able to report that we are already three-quarters of the way to our objective. This report covers not only these savings but in addition also covers absorbed costs and reductions. While the three categories are not always capable of hard and fast lines of delineation, I want to mention at this point that decisions and actions taken account for (1) savings, (2) absorbed costs, and (3) reduction, with the grand total in excess of $1,500,000,000. I shall discuss this at somewhat greater length later in this chapter.

Two different, but complementary, approaches were used to achieve economies in the operations of the Department of Defense.

First, there was established the Management Committee, an action group consisting of one representative of each military department of the rank of Assistant Secretary or higher, with my direct representative as chairman. This committee is exploring seven general areas in its economy program: (1) Curtailment of costly war-born spending habits; (2) elimination of excess facilities; (3) elimination of overlapping and duplication; (4) simplification of procedures; (5) better use of manpower; (6) modernization of organization structure; (7) establishment of better management controls. Specific savings directed by the management committee result from such actions as the elimination of excessive administrative and proficiency flying, elimination of unnecessary printing, reduction in number of administrative motor vehicles, and other economy measures.

Second, it was necessary to get the participation of all hands in the departments, who, because of their intimate knowledge of activities at the working level, could identify economies that could be made without impairing military effectiveness and, in many instances, could actually suggest ways of increasing combat effectiveness with lesser expenditure of our resources.

This all-hands effort, termed "reprograming," was stimulated by the concurrent identification by the Management Committee of specific areas where savings could be made.

The results of our efforts to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the Department of Defense will not be confined to a single year. Indeed, the lasting and tangible benefits of our economy efforts in fiscal 1950 have already been clearly reflected in the fiscal 1951 budget.

The most conservative estimates of the military departments on August 1, 1949, upon which the fiscal year 1951 budget was based, provided for certain forces and major matériel procurement within a $13,000,000,000 total. Because of the savings and economies instituted in fiscal 1950, the plans for 1951 have been modified to provide significantly more powerful military forces within the same dollar requirements. As compared with the estimates made by the military departments on August 1, Navy strength has been increased by three attack carriers, three carrier air groups, one cruiser, and one battleship in reduced commission. There will be two marine divisions instead of six battalion landing teams. The Army will be organized into 10 divisions rather than 9, and will also have 2 additional antiaircraft battalions. The Air Force will increase the number of planes per group in 3 additional bomber groups.

Also, since August 1, 1949, $150,000,000 was added to aircraft procurement for the Air Force and $50,000,000 for the Navy. In addition to a 200-percent increase in the allocation for antisubmarine warfare equipment, 700,000 hours were added for flying in combat-type units in the Navy, and Army civilian-component allocations were increased by $6,000,000 to rebuild and modernize equipment for the National Guard and $16,000,000 for armories for the Organized Reserve. Army matériel procurement was increased by $41,000,000, including $10,000,000 for new type signal equipment for the mobile striking forces of the Army, $17,500,000 for heavy ordnance, including special prime movers, and $7,800,000 for modernized portable bridges and other new engineer equipment.

We will not retreat from our basic objective of maximizing our national security and minimizing its cost. Our watchword must be economy and efficiency in every activity—with the size of our Military Establishment on as stable a basis as possible, subject to such increases or decreases as the international situation may warrant. Our goal continues to be well-trained, well-equipped, ready land, naval, and air forces.

PROCEDURES EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

In the remainder of this chapter, I shall discuss in greater detail just how we have carried out the program which I have outlined above in general terms.

Earlier, I mentioned that what we have actually been engaged in is the reprograming of our budget. The cooperative work that was done by this office and the Committees of the Congress, in the final phases of the enactment of the 1950 budget, were part and parcel of this reprograming process. During September 1949, the Congress was still considering the appropriation for the Department of Defense for the current

fiscal year, and had indicated its expectation of substantial savings. On this basis, in order to assist the Congress and the committees in their efforts to identify these savings, I advised the secretaries of the three military departments to take a number of steps to identify, at an early date, areas where costs might be reduced. These steps included:

1. Reductions in individual items in accordance with the action being taken by the Congress.

2. Reductions to reflect the gradual release of 1-year trainees in compliance with the policy decision being made by the Congress.

3. Reductions to reflect actual and anticipated lower commodity prices.

4. A review and report on all areas of possible savings.

5. The adjustment of military and civilian personnel strength to that required for planned activities in fiscal year 1951.

The Secretaries were advised that "In working out these savings it is expected that each department will make its adjustments in such a manner as to achieve the most efficient and effective military force within the limited funds available."

These initial steps led to identification of specific areas in which economies could be made and the results were made available, by the end of September, to the appropriate congressional committees. The net result of this process was that the 1950 budget, as enacted in October, contained reductions of $425,000,000 below the budget which the President had recommended in January. The principal decreases developed cooperatively by the Congress and the Department of Defense resulted from the curtailment of the 1-year enlistment program (a congressional policy decision), absorption of the cost of the radar fence, reductions in civilian personnel, price declines in subsistence, clothing, and fuel, reduction in administrative and proficiency type flying, and the substitution of commercial for military vehicles where practicable.[2]

[2] Inasmuch as final congressional action on the Department of Defense fiscal 1950 appropriation bill was not taken until the end of October, the results of our review and reprograming efforts have had to be measured in terms of the $14,200,000,000 budget requested by the President. The appropriation bill finally enacted by the Congress provided new obligational authority for fiscal 1950 of $13,900,000,000. This did not provide for approximately $339,000,000 to cover costs of the Career Compensation Act or for $161,000,000 of public works projects included in the President's budget as contingent items. Likewise the congressional appropriation did not allow for a number of other major added costs totaling approximately $260,000,000 not included in the President's budget. Had funds been requested and authorized for the public works contingent item and these absorbed costs, the total Department of Defense appropriation for fiscal 1950 would not have been $13,900,000,000 but approximately $14,700,000,000. This does not include $266,000,000 of savings below the President's budget jointly developed in our reprograming studies and by congressional committees and agreed upon around the end of September. We plan to absorb these added costs within our reprogramed $13,000,000,000 obligational ceiling for fiscal 1950 and we do not currently plan to seek appropriations for the public works items. It should also be pointed out that the final congressional appropriation of $13,900,000,000 included an increase over the President's request of $736,000,000 for aircraft procurement and maintenance in the Department of the Air Force. These funds have been placed in reserve by the President. This increase has not been included in the computation of savings, absorbed costs, and reductions discussed in this report.

Both during the congressional consideration referred to above, and thereafter, we continued our reprograming.

The primary objectives to be achieved in this reprograming were:

1. All possible reduction of overhead costs.

2. The elimination of nonproductive or unessential activities.

3. A channeling of funds into those activities which would strengthen the combat forces and increase their matériel support.

4. The phasing of fiscal 1950 activities to the levels that could be maintained in fiscal 1951.

Meantime, target ceilings for fiscal 1950 were established for each of the departments at restrictive levels to achieve the above objectives, and to insure the most rigorous possible review of plans and programs within each of the military departments. These initial planning ceilings were: Army, $4,050,000,000 (a reduction of $357,000,000); Navy, $3,850,000,000 (a reduction of $376,000,000); and Air Force, $4,400,000,000 (a reduction of $196,000,000). (As is customary, the President had in July established a tentative budget ceiling for the next fiscal year; in this case, $13,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1951.) Each of the military departments was directed to submit a revised program within these tentative ceilings as well as to demonstrate what could be accomplished within the amounts allocated and what significant program deficiencies might exist.

Testifying before the House Armed Services Committee on October 21, 1949, I said: "The strains and stresses upon the national economy which we have with us at the present time make it impossible for any service to get all that it wants, whether in dollars, in manpower strength, or in matériel. * * * But in considering the impact of the budget ceilings on the individual services, it should be borne in mind that the 1950 budget—and the 1951 budget as well—is based on an over-all plan for the defense of this Nation—a plan evolved by the best military minds in this or any other country. * * * The Department of Defense budget ceiling for 1951 has been set at $13,000,000,000. * * * This compares with the fourteen and four tenths billion (President's initial fiscal 1950 planning ceiling) * * * last year. We will have to effect the maximum possible savings within the Department of Defense in order to meet the $13,000,000,000 figure, and we will also have to make those reductions which the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel can best be made with the least impact on our military readiness. * * * Obviously, we are already making plans to shape the military establishment we will have during the remainder of fiscal 1950, in order that we may enter fiscal 1951 with approximately the military establishment we will be able to maintain during that year. * * * The problem of effecting adjustments in the programs of the three services is an extremely difficult one, and must, of course, be tied in directly with the strategic and logistic planning which is the statutory duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

At the time of this testimony we were in the process of subjecting the reprograming submitted by the departments for fiscal 1950 to analysis and evaluation. Detailed hearings, lasting well into November, were held at which the top echelons of each service and each major organization in the services participated. These hearings revealed that the revised programs initially submitted by the military departments cut too deeply into the bone and sinew of the organization instead of removing all of the fat.

The Army initially allocated substantial portions of the reduction to its target ceiling to the new modern equipment necessary to the proper arming of its mobile forces. The Navy and the Air Force initially proposed substantial reductions in aircraft procurement. As a result of a critical project by project evaluation headed by members of my staff, recommendations were made covering areas in which additional savings could be effected in overhead and in items of doubtful value, with these savings being applied to reinstate important major procurement items, and to restore funds for maintenance of civilian components and industrial mobilization.

Following this review, 2 days of discussion were held with the Army, Navy, and Air Force Secretaries and their principal military assistants, resulting in concurrence on most recommendations. The major problem areas remaining were discussed at a special meeting of the Armed Forces Policy Council in mid-November. At this meeting the Secretaries of the military departments and their military chiefs expressed their agreement with the adjusted reprograming with the exception of a few minor points. Five days later at another meeting of the Policy Council, these remaining points were resolved.

At each of the various stages of this process, adjustments were made in the amounts allocated as a result of the information presented by the three military departments and members of my staff. Revised budget ceilings have been established for each of the military departments—Army, $4,177,000,000; Navy, $3,985,000,000; and Air Force, $4,501,000,000. In addition to covering the cost of certain classified projects and military public works not included in the original target ceilings, the revised 1950 program provides approximately $165,000,000 more in major military procurement than was contained in the plans of the military departments in October 1949. It also provides for more tactical flying by both the Air Force and the Navy than proposed in October.

The figures set out above do not tell the whole story, of course. To these figures must be added the costs which the Department of Defense has absorbed out of funds appropriated, without asking for supplemental appropriations as might have been done. We have absorbed a cost of $339,000,000 for pay increases of military personnel, which was included in the President's 1950 budget as a contingent item. In addition, $257,000,000 of major costs, not included in the President's budget, are being absorbed by the Department of Defense. The principal items of absorbed costs in this latter category are:

Costs added by Classification Act of 1949	$29,000,000
Costs added by wage board actions	84,000,000
Costs added by higher freight and passenger rates	14,000,000
Direct costs of operating Berlin Airlift in July and August and its subsequent roll-up	49,000,000
One-time inactivation costs of installations and ships	71,000,000
Cost of additional classified project	10,000,000

The reduction in overhead and the elimination of nonessential items in fiscal 1950 establish a pattern which, carried forward into fiscal 1951, permits the maintenance of more effective forces and the procurement of substantially increased quantities of modern equipment within the $13,000,000,000 ceiling for that year.

SUMMARY OF SAVINGS AND REDUCTIONS

All of the above decisions and actions account for a total of $1,592,000,000 in savings, absorbed costs and reductions. This picture is shown below in terms of the major most elements of the Department of Defense.

Department of Defense—Summary of savings and reductions, fiscal year 1950—Estimate of Dec. 31, 1949, on basis of decisions and actions already taken

[Based on new obligational authority—millions of dollars]

Cost category	President's budget (1)	Absorbed costs not included in President's budget (2)	Total budget including absorbed costs (3)	Revised Department of Defense program (4)	Savings, absorbed costs and reductions (5)
Total, Department of Defense	14,218	257	14,475	13,000	−1,592
1. Military personnel costs	4,828	26	4,854	4,577	−377
2. Maintenance and operation	3,687	221	3,908	3,400	−508
3. Major procurement	2,964		2,964	2,529	−435
4. Public works construction	486		486	244	−242
5. Reserve forces	821		821	765	−56
6. Other military requirements	1,029	10	1,039	965	−74
7. Establishment-wide activities	403		403	403	
Reserve for emergencies				117	

A brief explanation of the above items is as follows:

1. Military personnel costs: The $377,000,000 net decrease in this category results from a number of actions, principally the phasing out in this fiscal year of the 1-year enlistees (in line with the policy decision of the Congress, expressed in the report on the fiscal 1950 appropriation bill), phasing of military personnel strength to the level that could be supported in fiscal 1951, lower costs of subsistence and clothing, the extension of monetary allowance system to all military services in lieu of issue of clothing in kind, adjustment of enlisted rating structure, and reduction of unnecessary travel and transportation through closer control. Approximately $26,000,000 of added costs not included in the President's budget have been absorbed in this category to allow for increased rail transportation rates and for the phasing out of military personnel connected with the Berlin airlift.

2. Maintenance and operation costs: The bulk of the $508,000,000 net decrease in this category arises from the dismissal of over 155,000 civilian employees [3] and the elimination of their housekeeping costs, and the closing or reduction in status of 51 military installations surplus to our peacetime needs. The annual rate of savings from the reduction of pay roll and housekeeping costs of these employees will be well in excess of half a billion dollars. The savings directly realizable in fiscal 1950 are less than this amount, because most of the reductions apply for only a portion of the year and because of accrued annual leave payments.

Part of the savings which have been effected in the maintenance and operation costs of the Department of Defense have been used to absorb approximately $220,000,000 of additional costs arising from the Classification Act of 1949, Wage Board increases in commercial and industrial-type installations, increases in freight rates, roll up of the Berlin airlift, and certain one-time added costs involved in the inactivation or reduction in status of installations.

3. Major procurement: Net decreases of approximately $435,000,000 have been made in major procurement programs from the amounts initially proposed in the President's budget. These have been determined after careful consideration of equipment requirements for balanced peacetime forces. No reductions have been made in the Army's major matériel procurement programs. In connection with the Army's requirements, the revised program provides for continued emphasis on modern antiaircraft equipment, tanks, electronic equipment, guided missiles, and tactical vehicles.

In the shipbuilding field a substantial number of naval prototypes, conversions, and new units are under way from prior year authorizations. Expenditures on this work will approximate $300,000,000 in the current year. Increased emphasis has been placed on antisubmarine warfare equipment and techniques.

[3] By January 31, 1950, this figure increased to 157,000.

The revised fiscal 1950 program provides for procurement of over 2,000 modern aircraft and continuance of a procurement program at approximately a $2,000,000,000 annual level.

In order to maintain a level rate of aircraft procurement at a $2,000,000,000 figure, our program reflects a reduction of $306,000,000 below the President's budget—a reduction of $180,000,000 for the Air Force, and $126,000,000 for the Navy. One of the considerations that entered into this action was the existing backlog of orders in this field, a backlog that will stand at $3,400,000,000 at the end of the current fiscal year. This $3,400,000,000 backlog, when added to the $2,000,000,000 presently before the Congress in the 1951 budget, will give a grand total, as of July 1, 1950, of approximately $5,500,000,000 of unexpended aircraft procurement authority.

4. Public works construction: Of the $242,000,000 reduction in military public works activities, $161,000,000 results from a decision to refrain from requesting financing during the current fiscal year. The remaining projects have been deferred, have been eliminated because of changed circumstances, or are being critically reviewed by the Department of Defense.

5. Reserve forces: Savings of $56,000,000 have been realized by utilizing existing stocks of equipment and material in lieu of new procurement and by reflecting decreased costs of clothing, fuel, subsistence, etc. These budgetary levels still permit the National Guard to increase its strength and the Organized Reserve Corps to increase participation in paid drills.

6. Other military requirements: Savings of approximately $64,000,000 are indicated in the area of other military requirements. The research and development program is being maintained at the same level as planned, in line with our continued emphasis on these activities. The principal decrease is reflected in a reduced allocation for plant studies and maintenance of stand-by plants and facilities where we believe substantial economies can be made.

7. Establishment-wide activities: These activities are being maintained at the same level proposed in the President's budget although in many cases new functions are being performed without increased costs.

The figures described above, if constructed on a project basis instead of on the major category basis outlined in the preceding pages, can be listed in the following form:

Derivation of savings and reductions [1]

[Rounded off to the nearest thousand]

	Fiscal year 1950 total
Phase out of 1-year enlistee program	[2] $78,827,000
Lowered cost of recruiting program	[2] 2,255,000
Price declines in fuel	[2] 26,360,000
Price declines in subsistence and clothing	[2] 44,863,000
Phasing of military personnel to fiscal year 1951 level	[2] 80,495,000
Lowered cost of printing and binding	[2] $2,281,000
Inactivation of administrative vehicles and substitution of civilian-type vehicles for heavy military-type vehicles	[2] 11,390,000
Inactivation of facilities surplus to peacetime needs	[2] 169,195,000
Lowered cost of petroleum reserves	[2] 500,000
Lowered cost of classified project	[2] 2,134,000
Restrictions on civilian travel	[2] 393,000
Bringing the rating structure of enlisted men into line with actual distribution and the structure plan for fiscal year 1951	9,940,000
Institution of the monetary maintenance allowance system in lieu of issue in kind	13,797,000
Reduced requirement for Air Force subsistence	3,683,000
Lower requirement for feeding indigenous persons overseas	3,172,000
Curtailing and closely examining requirements for issuance of change-of-station travel orders	3,653,000
Lowered cost of quarters allowances for enlisted personnel resulting from adjustments in the rating structures	1,900,000
Savings in flight pay through decreased number of pilots	1,978,000
Early discharges, releases of CAD officers, and lower requirements for recruit outfits	9,426,000
Reduced requirement for operation of aircraft	4,962,000
Decrease in depot and base supply and maintenance	4,226,000
Lower fuel requirements from reduction in steaming hours of the active fleet and operation of a smaller fleet	2,600,000
Curtailment of the use of chartered tankers	2,000,000
Rescheduling and combining cargo shipments	7,960,000
Lowered operating expenses of ships other than fuel	8,000,000
Adjusting schedules for ship overhauls, reevaluation of scope of work required for individual ships, and accomplishment of increased self-maintenance by ships' crews	10,000,000
Decrease in the total communications requirements for the Department of Defense including those resulting from the operation of AFSA	6,640,000
Reduced procurement of organizational clothing, motor transport spare parts, general supply items, signal supply items, and curtailment of repairs, upkeep, and improvements for Marine Corps	1,000,000
Lower level of support for courts martial, chaplain supplies, miscellaneous schools, etc	709,000
Curtailment of major repairs and replacements and general maintenance of naval facilities	7,621,000
Lower procurement in major categories as follows:	
Aircraft	306,795,000
Ships	34,430,000
Weapons	4,672,000
Ammunition	9,500,000
Guided missiles	4,200,000

See footnotes at end of table.

See footnote at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1950 total
Lower procurement in major categories as follows—Con.	
Vehicles (including purchase of civilian type instead of heavy military types)	$36,000,000
Advance base components	20,099,000
Miscellaneous major procurement	86,400,000
Reduced or deferred public works construction	[1] 256,437,000
Savings through consolidation of reserve training facilities, joint use of facilities and inactivation of some smaller training vessels while at the same time extending the training schedules of some of the larger vessels which will accommodate greater numbers of reserve personnel for training	13,488,000
Reevaluation of research and development projects	17,187,000
Cancellation of the quinquennial overhauls of reserve fleet vessels and reduced preservation and maintenance of other war reserves	13,472,000
Curtailment of information and education activities	330,000
Employment of better traffic policies and procedures in the operation of a central military land traffic office	1,610,000
Reduction in cost of Air National Guard, ROTC, and Reserve	8,813,000
Reduction of leased space after consolidation of activities	74,000
Reduction and unification of military attaché office staffs	1,436,000
Lower cost of planned field exercises	500,000
Savings in maintenance and operation of hospital facilities	5,321,000
General appropriation reprograming by deferred maintenance, personnel reductions or turn-over, lower level of operation in order to absorb wage board and other pay increases	156,535,000
Flying hours	57,662,000
Reevaluation of industrial mobilization	25,928,000
Price declines in miscellaneous supplies	2,694,000
Portion of contingency item for Career Compensation Act not required	61,000,000
Total	1,592,093,000

[1] Does not include a large number of items which will lead to future savings, including, for example, savings in fiscal 1950 resulting from the inactivation or change in status of 18 military medical hospitals, directed on February 1, 1950. This step will alleviate the acute shortage of physicians in the armed services and effect recurring annual savings, of about $25,000,000 (permitting this saving in dollars or a transfer of effort to combat support, or both) without affecting the quality of medical services available to military personnel and their dependents. For a general discussion of items that will lead to future savings, of which this hospital illustration is an example, see below.

[2] Reduction partially reflected in appropriation act.

NOTE.—Most projects listed are affected by the civilian personnel reduction. Civilian personnel savings in fiscal year 1950 will total $200,000,000—and $500,000,000 in terms of the annual rate of savings.

A large number of the items outlined above clearly represent savings, many of which will continue in future years. A number of other items clearly represent reductions. Many items, however, cannot be categorized solely as either savings or reductions, since they contain elements of both. An examination of the project-by-project list set out above shows many areas of major savings—savings which, in the aggregate, represent an annual rate of $750,000,000,000. Examples of the items that enter into this total are our savings in the field of civilian personnel (aggregating $500,000,000, in terms of the annual rate of savings, and spread across substantially every item on the foregoing list), our savings through consolidation of the military attaché systems, savings in printing and binding, in clothing-allowance systems, in the use of administrative vehicles, in administrative and proficiency flying, and similar measures.

In reviewing the items listed above, it should be borne in mind that there are many items that could be carried at specific dollar figures, if we were willing to proceed on a basis of conjecture, instead of on a basis of fact. We have preferred, however, to err on the side of conservatism in preparing this list—and have therefore included only those items which can be identified as of the present time. If we already had the performance budget in effect throughout the Department of Defense—as authorized by act of Congress on August 10, 1949—it would be incomparably easier to prepare a full and detailed list—but converting long-standing budgetary procedures into a performance budget is a complex and time-consuming process. It will be more than a year before we can identify all areas of savings in a manner which I consider adequate—but I do want to mention at this point that there are many items which are not specifically identified on the foregoing list, for the reason I have just mentioned.

In addition to the items I have just been discussing, we have in process of study or implementation many other items which will yield substantial savings in future years. Among these items may be enumerated the following: The consolidation of oceangoing shipping; the results of our cataloging project; savings in the medical field in addition to those covered by the announcement of February 1 concerning general hospitals; further streamlining of the supply systems of the Department of Defense; further savings in the field of land transportation, including improved traffic management, and further savings in the operation of the consolidated Military Air Transport Service; further savings through more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel; savings from improved joint utilization of research and technical facilities; savings through library consolidations; further savings in the communications field; and major savings that should result from work now under way in training and educational programs.

In my opinion, the best evidence of the continuing character of the savings which have already been achieved is the over-all comparison of the military program for fiscal year 1951 with the military program for fiscal year 1950. I summarized this to the House Appropriations Committee on January 12, when I said:

"In the course of your hearings at this session your committee will find reflected in the detailed estimates reduced dollar requirements for many functions and activities of the Department of Defense. These reduced requests reflect what we have already done and what we confidently feel we can do in the coming year in providing support for an effective military force at a lesser cost.

"In closing I would like to sketch in broad outline the results of our efforts to achieve our common objectives. This budget contemplates, as stated in the President's message:

"That 'total personnel assigned to combat forces will be the greatest since the completion of demobilization following World War II.'

"That $2,000,000,000 will be available for aircraft procurment—about the same as the volume of orders placed under fiscal year 1949 authority and planned for use in fiscal year 1950.

"That, military personnel will be slightly less in total number than in 1950—but requiring almost the same allocation of funds.

"That the National Guard and the Air National Guard will be continued throughout fiscal year 1951 on a level program at the strengths attained during the current fiscal year—and that the Organized and Volunteer Reserve forces will be continued at approximately the current level.

"That with the exception of shipbuilding—and aircraft procurement mentioned above—other major procurement will be increased.

"That research and development and industrial mobilization will be continued at about the same level as in fiscal year 1950.

"This is the defense structure for which we request $13,000,000,000 this year as compared with the $14,200,000,000 which was requested for last year."

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I stated that the record shows, without serious conflict, that subversives and Communist agents are coming into the United States, and that the administration of the act by officials of the Displaced Persons Commission stationed in Europe is not in the best interests of the country, but that the welfare of the Nation is a secondary consideration.

I expect today to read from the testimony of officials of the United States Government, which will substantiate in toto every statement I have made. Before going into that phase of the matter, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary was ordered by the Senate to conduct a thorough and full investigation of the question of displaced persons. A large sum of money was appropriated by the Senate to conduct the investigation. The committee held exhaustive hearings over a period of many months. We worked zealously and conscientiously to draft and report the best possible bill, under the circumstances, with due regard to the interests of displaced persons and with due regard to the safety and security of our country. We divorced ourselves from the propaganda disseminated by the million-dollar lobby, which has attempted to mislead and deceive the American people into favoring the passage of a measure which, I state candidly, would endanger the safety and security of every family in the United States. We have reported to the Senate the best bill we know how to write.

Mr. President, the question is not whether displaced persons will be admitted into the United States. The question is not whether we shall accept our share of the displaced persons. Each of the two measures—the bill reported by the committee and the sub-

stitute—will result in the admission of approximately the same number of displaced persons. The controversy, as between the committee bill and the substitute sponsored by the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from New York, and other Senators, is not on the question of the admission of displaced persons. It solely and exclusively is on the question of screening, the question of better administration, the question of better protecting the United States.

The Senate bill is anchored on the rock of the testimony of officials of the United States Government who have to do with the matter involved. The Senate bill is not based on hearsay or rumor or misinformation, but it is based on the testimony of officials of the Displaced Persons Commission, on the testimony of officials of the Immigration Service, and on the direct request of the consular officials of the United States, who say they must have authority, from the Congress, to veto the applications of displaced persons on the ground that they do not qualify, because they are being selected, in the first place, by displaced persons themselves, by aliens in an alien organization; and because, as one official of the Displaced Persons Commission says, the documents of the IRO are a scandal, the whole thing is a racket, and they are not worthy of belief. Mr. President, that report went to the head of the Displaced Persons Commission in Washington. Yet to this day no effort has been made to correct the situation.

So I say that the issue here is not whether displaced persons will be admitted to the United States. The issue here is solely what is best for the protection of the United States, which is the best method for the admission of 320,000 displaced persons to the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does the Senator care to yield before he concludes his speech?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In a colloquy yesterday afternoon in which several Senators, including the Senator from Mississippi, engaged, the statement which has just been made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi was made relative to the work of the IRO and the evidence which was submitted by officials of the Displaced Persons Commission and by the immigration authorities as to the actual practice of the IRO organization.

It seems to me that in determining a definition, which I understand is now the burden of the committee, Senators must resolve that issue on the basis of whether the definition in the present law permits the IRO to do what the Senator from Mississippi says it is doing in actual practice, and whether it is necessary for us to adopt a new definition which will prescribe standards under which the IRO, the Displaced Persons Commission, and the immigration authorities will act in this matter by authorization of Congress. Am I correct in that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course. It is simply a question of whether the IRO is going to exercise executive and legislative authority in the United States, or whether the Congress will exercise its authority in the premises.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the issue, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; that is the issue.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will permit, I should like to ask five or six questions, because I wish to clear up this matter in my own mind.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to have the Senator ask his questions, and I shall be glad to answer them; but if the Senator will permit, first I should like to read the testimony of an official of the Displaced Persons Commission. Then, in the light of that testimony, I shall welcome questions from the Senator from Nebraska. I think he will like to have that information before him.

Mr. WHERRY. First I was going to ask what the Senator meant by his observations. Then I was going to ask for supporting testimony.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. This is the question: Will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a short statement clarifying this entire situation with regard to the unquestioned authority of the State Deparment, through its consular service, and of the Immigration and Naturalization Service?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, of course I have the floor. The Senator from New York can take the floor in his own time and can speak and can present his own memorandum and can speak in his own time. That is the usual parliamentary procedure.

But I say to the Senator from New York that, so far as the consular service is concerned, the Senate Judiciary Committee simply carried out the request of the consular service of the United States, the head of which appeared before the entire Judiciary Committee on two occasions.

So I say to the Senator from New York that I will yield for a question, but I will not yield for him to make a speech in my time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I shall not attempt to make a speech in the Senator's time, without the Senator's consent. I thought the short clarifying statement I desired to make possibly would obviate the necessity for the five or six questions the Senator from Nebraska has indicated he is about to ask.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. That is all I have the right to yield for, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have asked whether the Senator does not think it would save time if I were to read this clarifying statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have the clarifying statement here, Mr. President, and as I told the Senator, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in the bill itself, carried out solely and exclusively the request of the head of the consular service. I now read——

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator has stated, has he not, it was a specific request of the consular service?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia was present at the committee meetings when the head of the consular service, Mr. L'Heureux, came before the committee and made the request. He told the committee of conditions in Germany, and made the request, which is carried forward in the committee bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Then the Senator from Mississippi is stating to the Senate that the head of the consular service is requesting the right to pass upon the eligibility of people, to determine whether they are displaced persons. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator knows——

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. EASTLAND. I am answering a question.

Mr. KILGORE. It is not a question of whether I was present; it is a question of the Senator's——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I can answer a question in any way I desire. The Senator from West Virginia certainly cannot ask me a question and then put the words in my mouth and dictate the form in which I shall answer it. I stated that Mr. L'Heureux—and I am now informed he is not the head of the consular service, but head of the Visa Division in the State Department—who had been in Europe, appeared before the committee. I was present and other committee members were present. As I remember, my distinguished friend from West Virginia was present. Mr. L'Heureux stated that they must have the veto power, and therefore we placed it in the bill at his request. He appeared before the subcommittee. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia made some complaint that he did not know what was happening in the subcommittee, so we got Mr. L'Heureux to appear before the full committee, and the same request was repeated. Let me state further that, the same afternoon, if I remember correctly, my friend from West Virginia attempted to secure the adoption by the committee of a substitute adopted which would not give Mr. L'Heureux the authority he had requested.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi whether the testimony of Mr. L'Heureux on this point has been printed?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not know whether it has been printed. I am not in charge——

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. The Senator asked me a question, and I

will answer it. I am not in charge of printing testimony in the committee. The Senator from West Virginia is senior to me on the committee. If it was not printed, I am certain the Senator could have caused it to be printed, had he requested it; but I do not know. The Senator was present when Mr. L'Heureux was there; the Senator heard everything I heard from Mr. L'Heureux, and I am sure the Senator can verify the accuracy of the statement I have made.

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the Senator that the verification——

Mr. EASTLAND. I am now informed that the testimony was not reported; that it was an informal meeting at which Mr. L'Heureux appeared before the committee. He made the request, and, of course, there was no point in taking down the request in writing.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I felt sure, because the chief consultant of the Judiciary Committee on this matter was sitting beside the Senator, that he would find that out. It is a question of interpretation of Mr. L'Heureux's statement. One interpretation might be placed upon it by, shall I say, Mr. Arens——

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. Another by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]——

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. Another by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]——

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. And another by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no, Mr. President. Any person who can hear and understand the English language could not place two interpretations on what Mr. L'Heureux said. Let me tell my friend from West Virginia, I was present on two or three occasions. I heard Mr. L'Heureux; I have made my own interpretation, and I think my interpretation is in line with the interpretation of every other member of the committee. It was a simple request.

Mr. KILGORE. May I again ask the indulgence of the Senator from Mississippi, to state that the recollection of the Senator from Mississippi as to the interpretation, and that of the Senator from West Virginia, are entirely different? So I cannot accept the statement of the Senator from Mississippi that it was the opinion of all members of the committee. Certainly it was not the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I ask——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me state, Mr. President, in fairness to Mr. L'Heureux, that he did not come before the committee on his own initiative. He was requested by the committee to come for the purpose of giving information and of answering questions. At those meetings he asked for the authority the committee bill gives him, which authority the Senator from West Virginia would deny. The consular service can veto the Immigration Service: the Immigration Service, in a matter pertaining to an immigrant, can veto the consular service. Why cannot the consular service veto the Displaced Persons Commission on all matters? Why cannot the Immigration Service veto the Displaced Persons Commission on all matters? Why should the Displaced Persons Commission be placed on a pedestal? Why should it be said that on questions of eligibility under the act, its word is final and conclusive? If the consul, because of the evidence before him, knows that a so-called displaced person was not in the zones in Germany on the date in question, and knows the documents are false and fraudulent, why should he not be in a position to object. In the name of all fairness, what is to be lost by giving the power of veto to the consular service and to the Immigration Service?

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not possible today for the Immigration Service to declare that the statement was false, and therefore to exclude the applicant because of false statements?

Mr. EASTLAND. Solely if it comes within the terms of a violation of the immigration law, but not under the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why would not a false statement relative to residents be such a fraud on the Immigration Service as to warrant its exclusion of the applicant?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator asks why would it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. But is it not a fact that the Immigration Service can exclude displaced persons?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. JENNER. No.

Mr. EASTLAND. All the testimony shows they cannot.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not so understand the testimony at the hearing.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am going to read it to the Senator. The Senator will understand, in a minute, if he will accord me the courtesy of listening to the reading of the testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator certainly is entitled to courtesy.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is a question. Does the Senator not realize that the statements he has made and the statement he has attributed to Mr. L'Heureux, of the State Department, refer to the entry of persons who are connected with affiliates of international organizations, or with other nations, or with the United Nations Organization, UNESCO, the Soviet Government, and so on. Does the Senator not know that?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; and that is not true, Mr President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Could the Senator point——

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New York is in good faith. Under no condition would I attribute bad faith to the Senator in making the statement he has made. The testimony which the Senator has in mind was taken in connection with the bill of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] having to do with subversives. It has nothing in the world to do with the appearances of Mr. L'Heureux before the subcommittee on the displaced-persons bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Did not the Senator from Mississippi, a few minutes ago, attribute a statement to Mr. L'Heureux? Would the Senator have any objection to pointing out the exact part of the testimony to which he made reference?

Mr. EASTLAND. The testimony on another bill is entirely distinct from and foreign to the bill now under consideration by the Senate. The Senator from New York speaks of other testimony. If my veracity is challenged, there are many members of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the floor of the Senate who heard the testimony and heard the request, not once, but several times.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I want to ask a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question, and that is all.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator from Mississippi, in all fairness, trying to get all the members of the Judiciary Committee to acquiesce in his interpretation of a statement which was made, but not recorded, according to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I was not following the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator from New York was pulling a green book on me, and I wanted to see what it was. I shall first answer the Senator from New York. The book which the Senator from New York has is with reference to hearings on Senate bill 1832. The bill now under consideration is House bill 4567. The Senator from New York was waving an entirely different book of hearings held by the subcommittee, and, of course, he could not find anything regarding the displaced persons bill in testimony taken on another bill.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the same subcommittees handled both hearings and that the same staff was used in connection with those hearings?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. There were two separate subcommittees.

Mr. KILGORE. Not being a member of either of the subcommittees, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi to tell me the membership of the subcommittee to which he refers.

Mr. EASTLAND. There were two separate subcommittees.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask as to the membership?

Mr. EASTLAND. My friend from West Virginia has given a demonstration of the fact that Senators have not gone into the subject thoroughly and do not understand it. If they had, there would not be any question about this bill. My friend from West Virginia has proved my point. The difficulty is the lack of understand of the bill. Senators are so busy that they have not had time to go into the question.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask if members of the committee as a whole were advised when subcommittee hearings were being held?

Mr. EASTLAND. Many of them were advised. I am advised that my friend from West Virginia was invited and that he attended a number of hearings. He attended the meeting at which the testimony of Mr. Donald W. Main was given. Mr. Main was an officer of the Displaced Persons Commission at the time he testified, and the Senator from West Virginia heard his testimony.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that that committee meeting was a meeting of the entire Judiciary Committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. My information is that it was a subcommittee meeting to which the entire Judiciary Committee was invited. The Senator from West Virginia had raised the point that the entire committee did not know what was happening at the hearings, and, therefore, to meet his objection, which I think was well taken, the entire committee was invited, and the Senator from West Virginia attended.

I desire to read the testimony given by Mr. Main——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask a further question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a further question.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that while the entire committee was invited, some of the testimony which is being produced here was never produced before the full committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. There were public hearings. Which meetings the Senator attended I do not know, but they were all public hearings, or most of them at least, where testimony was taken. I know the Senator from West Virginia was present when the testimony of the former officer who had been in charge of certain phases of intelligence work in Germany was given, and the Senator complimented the gentleman on his fine appearance and his sincerity.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that it was at the request of the Senator from West Virginia that Mr. L'Heureux, and the head of the Immigration Service, and others were called to the public hearing?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot answer that question, because I was not present when the Senator made such a request. However, if the Senator says it was done, of course his statement satisfies me.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me that it does not make any difference whether the witness testified before a subcommittee or before the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from New York is of one opinion, in all sincerity, and the Senator from West Virginia is of another opinion. I am sure that the Senator from Mississippi is also sincere in his opinion. I should like to hear the testimony. Is the Senator about to read the testimony?

Mr. EASTLAND. I intend to read it when my colleagues permit me to continue. I desire to be courteous. Of course, I think I should be asked questions, for I want this matter to come to light in full.

Mr. WHERRY. We should hear the testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Senators will permit me to read the testimony, I shall gladly do so. I am about to read the testimony of Mr. Donald W. Main.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator made reference to testimony given by Mr. L'Heureux, of the State Department. That is the testimony which I believe Senators are interested in. I understood the Senator to say that the hearings were public. If they were public, certainly every member of the Judiciary Committee and every Member of the Senate is entitled to the record.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let us be fair. The Senator from New York certainly heard me say on several occasions that the testimony of Mr. L'Heureux was not taken down. We asked him to give us some information in an informal consultation. He gave us the information, and the provision he requested was put in the bill. My friend from New York heard me say that. Let us be absolutely fair and square. I know men can differ, but I say, Mr. President, that when the facts in this controversy are known, as far as the rank and file of the Senate are concerned, there cannot be much conflict.

I shall refer now to the testimony of Mr. Donald W. Main, who is the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission in charge of the office at Munich, Germany. He testified on February 14 of this year, approximately 2 weeks ago. Let us see what Mr. Main said. He is talking about IRO, which the Senator from Nebraska asked me about. That is the international organization which initiates everything and plays a most important part in the program.

Mr. MAIN. They [the IRO] prepare documentation in the names of these persons. They certify to us—

He is talking about the Displaced Persons Commission—

that the person is a displaced person within the meaning of the IRO's constitution, and the concern of IRO.

In addition to that, they certify that their records show that the individual entered Germany, Austria, or Italy on a particular date and that they were in one of the western zones or sectors on January 1, 1948, or otherwise, if that is the case.

Let me say there that I shall shortly put into the RECORD exhibits consisting of Government documents which show the fraud and bribery used to create fictitious dates so as to enable criminals to come into the United States.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to yield when I have finished reading this testimony. He testified that the records and certifications by the IRO were prepared by displaced persons employed by the International Refugee Organization.

Mr. President, how can there be objection to providing that the files must be initiated and compiled by American citizens and by an American organization? Who can object to that?

I read further from Mr. Main's testimony:

Mr. MAIN. I think that these decisions as to eligibility under the act * * * which is an interpretation of IRO's constitution, that decision should be made by citizens of the United States.

I invite the attention of Senators to that statement. Here is a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission who says that the decisions as to eligibility should be initiated by citizens of the United States. He is the only senior officer with immigration experience. The others were put there by UNRRA and are former employees of UNRRA and former employees of voluntary agencies whose duty it was to rush immigrants in here, law or no law.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The answer to the question which I asked the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, if I interpret correctly his observation, as well as the evidence which he has presented, is that the issue here in the first place is whether or not an applicant is the concern of IRO, or whether he is the concern of Congress acting through an authorized agency.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The evidence which the Senator is now offering was given by the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission, who testified that a subdivision of the American Government ought to be the one to make the final test of the definition.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and he is the only senior officer who has had immigration experience.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that testimony available?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is available.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it on the desks of Senators?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know whether it is in the hearings or not.

Mr. WHERRY. Is testimony being taken daily now, as we debate the question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Testimony is being taken daily. In fact, the bill was reported while the testimony was being taken. We were rushed to get the bill out under an order of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. It is unfortunate that we do not have the testimony available.

Mr. EASTLAND. By the way, we are to hold a hearing tonight. Now let me continue. The Senator has not heard anything yet.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not read the testimony because it is not available. It is not the fault of any Senator that we do not have the testimony which is being read now. I am not blaming the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the fault of the Senate. I shall state where the blame lies. The Senate said the bill had to be reported to the Senate by the 30th day of January, and we could not get these gentlemen to come here from Europe before that time.

Mr. WHERRY. It is very difficult for Senators to make up their minds when one Senator's statement is in complete contradiction with the statement of another Senator on a question of fact, and we do not even have the evidence before us. Now let me read further.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may give a brief answer to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, but I ask the Senator to be brief.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that it is difficult for Senators to form an opinion when statements are made with regard to testimony given before committees of the Senate of which no record has been kept, and those officials who are alleged to have given the testimony are quoted as giving testimony entirely contradictory to the plain facts, which I shall submit to the Senate a little later.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the testimony I was reading was taken at a public hearing of a Senate committee. As to Mr. L'Heureux's statement, as I have said, that was not testimony. No one knows better than does the Senator from New York that it was not testimony. It was a statement at an informal meeting, and the present Presiding Officer [Mr. WITHERS in the chair] was present at that meeting, and knows exactly what happened.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me ask the Senator whether it was off-the-record testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, it was not off the record. We asked Mr. L'Heureux to come up to the Capitol. He was here three times. He was before the subcommittee, he was before the full committee. We all heard what he said. We wrote into the bill the language he requested to have inserted. We certainly would not have put it in the bill if he had not asked us to do it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thought the able Senator from Mississippi said it was at a public hearing.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield for a question only.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York understands that this was a public hearing, and is it not a fact——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. What I have stated time and time again to the Senator was that Mr. L'Heureux was called up for an informal consultation. We went over the bill with him. He requested that they could better protect this country if they were given the veto power. Information was given us. He gave us information about different zones in Germany, and acting on his requests, we put provisions in the bill.

It is unheard of in the Senate, when an officer of the Government comes up to the Capitol to confer with Senators on a bill and make suggestions, to take down his testimony and write it out and pass it around to everybody. What he suggested is in the bill. We scrupulously did what we said we would do.

Now, Mr. President, I shall read further. I want to finish Mr. Main's testimony, then I shall yield to any questions any Senator desires to ask.

Question. Mr. Main, are these people in IRO who make their determination on those points in some instances citizens of countries other than the United States?

Mr. MAIN. I think in most instances.

Note that, Mr. President. There was the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission stating that the determination of eligibility for people to come to this country to become citizens is by people who are not citizens of the United States.

Question. What countries are these citizens of, for the most part?

Mr. MAIN. They are what they call class 1 employees of IRO, which includes English, Dutch, Canadian, and all participants of the IRO, I think.

Question. To what extent are the records of the IRO, which you receive, prepared by Displaced Persons themselves?

I call special attention to this, Mr. President. The Senator from New York and the Senator from West Virginia want to retain a system under which displaced persons are selecting displaced persons to come to the United States. That is the desire, to have a system like that in existence today, under which displaced persons are selecting displaced persons to come here. Listen to what this man says:

Almost all of the records, the documentation received, is prepared by displaced persons employed by IRO.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not being a member of the committee, I am not so familiar with the subject under discussion as are some other Senators, and I should like to ask, for enlightenment, whether these initial papers which are prepared, as alleged, by displaced persons themselves, are then scrutinized and processed to the same effect as if they had not been prepared by displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. I will say to the Senator that the record shows, I think the proof is, that practically the entire information on which action is taken is prepared by an international organization, and that organization has a legal division set up to get paroles for criminals so that they can come to this country as displaced persons.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many parolees have come?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have the figures in the records in my possession. I will have to take that matter up in its turn. I cannot put my hand on it at the moment. I will say to the Senator that the testimony of a former Army officer, who came before the full Committee on the Judiciary, an officer who had been in charge of certain phases of military intelligence in Germany, was that they had caught Russian agents, Russian Army officers, whom the Russians were attempting to get through as displaced persons.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator mean, to plant them in the displaced persons' camps?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, ultimately; so as to get them into this country. And when they caught some Russian Army officers—I repeat, army officers, Mr. President—and arrested them, the Russians arrested two American officers in retaliation, and held them for several months. The officer in question testified that beyond any peradventure of a doubt Communist agents had gotten into this country by reason of lax screening.

I want to tell the Senator from Maryland something else about screening. I will say this to begin with: The McCarran bill and the substitute would let into this country about an equal number of displaced persons. There can be no question about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a difference of only 9,000 between the two measures, as I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is substantially correct.

Listen to this testimony:

Question. Do you know of any instances in which the Displaced Persons Commission or its employees have solicited pardons for convicted displaced persons, in order to make them eligible under the law?

This question was asked of Mr. Tripp. Mr. Tripp is a United States official in charge of the immigration detail in Europe.

Answer. I know that IRO does that. IRO, in fact, maintains a legal division just to try to get pardons for displaced persons.

Mr. TYDINGS. What are the offenses with which these persons are charged? What kind of offenses are they?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot answer that question. One of them is murder. I will tell the Senator this about screening——

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator leaves that point. Have we admitted anyone who has been paroled after conviction on the charge of murder—knowingly, I mean?

Mr. EASTLAND. Thirty-four. Not murder alone, but for serious crimes.

Mr. TYDINGS. What are the serious crimes?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator could remember one other, say, I would have some kind of a yardstick.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would not attempt to make that statement, because it might be inaccurate. But I want to make this point to the Senator respecting the system of screening that is practiced. What I say is not hearsay. It comes from witnesses. The Government maintains the Berlin Document Center, as the Senator knows, to find out the political affiliations of persons who have been interned. The Provost Marshal General of the Army maintains lists of those who have been convicted. The record shows that the Displaced Persons Commission have testified, "We have taken a deliberate and calculated risk." When the IRO file

comes to them they send it to the Berlin Document Center and to the Provost Marshal's office to obtain the information about the man in question. They do not wait for the report, however, but rush him on into this country. They say, "We have taken a calculated risk."

Mr. TYDINGS. If persons are to be permitted to enter under this bill, I should think there would be plenty of deserving ones over there, persons who would certainly have no criminal record, who would be preferable for us to bring in, without taking in those who have criminal records.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, with his razor-sharp mind, has put his finger in a second on the issue here. It is just as the Senator says. What we are trying to do is to improve the system, for bringing desirable persons here.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there should be, of course, a large element of humanitarianism in this program, but at the same time it ought to be applied to the deserving in preference to the undeserving. I am considerably shocked to learn that persons who have been charged with heinous offenses are paroled and admitted to the United States. It seems to me the Senator has made a rather serious charge, and I know he is not given to reckless statements.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am reading the record of the testimony of officials of the Government.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to answer the question of the Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Maryland says he is shocked. I want the Senator to listen to this letter:

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES
DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION,
Frankfurt, July 28, 1949.

To: Mr. Donald W. Main, senior officer, area 6.
From: Alex E. Squadrilli, Coordinator.
Subject: Kohn, Josef.

Listen to this:

The above-captioned file is returned herewith for reprocessing as directed below.

As far as the Commission is concerned, rejections under section 10 of the act in document and perjury cases must be based upon proof—either the record of a court conviction, or a confession in writing—

The law says the burden of proof is upon the applicant; that he must bear the burden to show that he is of good moral character. I continue to read—

either the record of a court conviction, or a confession in writing, or a signed consular statement to the effect that the applicant committed perjury, or was previously denied a visa because of the submission of false documents.

If the applicant is otherwise acceptable, you will, therefore, write a favorable report with appropriate reference therein to the allegation of record and the Commission findings in the premises.

Now listen:

Please withdraw from the file all previous Commission reports and notifications before forwarding same to the consul.

This letter may be incorporated in the file in support of the directed action.

ALEX E. SQUADRILLI,
Coordinator.

When there was an unfavorable report on the man it was ordered withdrawn from the file.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator attribute the condition he describes to the law, or to the incapacity of those who are administering the law?

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator be good enough to repeat his question? There was some talking going on behind me and I did not hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. There is sufficient disturbance so the Senator from Mississippi cannot hear the question addressed to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator attribute the conditions he has described to (a) a fault in the law itself, or (b) to the lack of capacity of the administrators, or (c) to a policy which the administrators themselves have assumed which is not permissible under the law?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think the fault lies with the law; in fact, I know it does not. It is a deliberate evasion of the act. The Displaced Persons Commission, under the law, is not supposed to direct the selections and operations in Europe. It was the congressional intent that that aspect of the matter should be handled by the Immigration Service and the consular service. But the Displaced Persons Commission has assumed control there under Executive order. We are solely and simply attempting to tighten up the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the case the Senator used as an illustration does not represent a prevalent condition, but rather that the case is an isolated one. But even assuming that it is isolated——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I read an order from the headquarters in Europe to withdraw the unfavorable matter from the files.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I am coming to. What authority had the American administrator to issue a letter of that kind which would seem to present an applicant for admission into this country in a more favorable light than the record indicates would be warranted?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think that is pretty general practice. The law says that the burden is on the applicant to prove that he is not a Communist; to prove that he was in the camps at certain dates. The counterintelligence representatives say that they must absolutely prove by court records, or a confession in writing, that a man was a Communist or that he was a Russian agent, and that even though they have information which leads them to believe it, yet the person is processed and sent here anyway, unless there is absolute proof that he is a Communist agent. They further state that it is practically impossible in Germany to get court records because the system there now is largely informal.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator this final question, because I do not want to interrupt his speech at great length. Outside the difference between the two propositions of numbers, one bill providing roughly for about 350,000 persons, and the other for about 359,000 persons, is the principal remaining difference between the two propositions that on the one hand the system which the Senator has described is retained more or less intact, and on the other hand there is additional screening to take care of the situation he has described?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, here is the principal difference——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). The Senator will suspend for a moment, please. There are in the Chamber Senators who persist in talking to one another while in their seats. Their voices are stronger than they realize, and the carrying power of their voices is much greater than they think it is. If they wish to continue their conversations they should retire to the cloakrooms, rather than to carry on conversations in the Senate Chamber and prevent other Senators from hearing the Senator who has been recognized to speak or Senators who wish to ask questions of the Senator who has the floor. There must be order.

The Chair asks the Senator who has the floor to remain silent until the conversations in the Chamber cease. [A pause.] The Senator from Mississippi may now proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, here is the difference: Both the House bill and the substitute retain the same system, whereby an international organization, the IRO, whose personnel in policy-making positions are French, Dutch, English, and Canadian; and the persons who do the work under them are displaced persons—initiates the file and puts in it the necessary information, and sends it to the Displaced Persons Commission, and says, for instance, that "Hans Schmidt is in our care, and is a displaced person." The Displaced Persons Commission cannot say that Hans Schmidt is eligible to come to this country as a displaced person, under the law passed by the Congress, because the Displaced Persons Commission is bound by the file initiated by the IRO.

The law now in effect adopted as the definition of a displaced person, the definition which is found in the IRO constitution. In the committee bill, we attempt to change that definition. First, we define a displaced person. The definition we use is as broad as that contained in the constitution of the IRO. We say, however, that no foreign organization shall have the power to define who is a displaced person for admission into the United States. So in the bill we draw up the definition.

Then we say the entire subject matter shall be initiated by American citizens; and the applicants shall be investigated and handled by American citizens; and only an American organization, a branch of our Government, shall participate in the selection of the displaced persons who shall come to the United States.

The testimony of one of the officials—I have forgotten whether he was an official of the consular service or of some other agency—was that an applicant for admission to the United States as a displaced person did not see an American citizen until he got to the consul; in other words, not until after he had

cleared the IRO and the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, does not the United States have some representatives on the IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is not in the proof. We put up a part of the money.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should think we would have some representatives on the IRO.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I should judge so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Likewise, I should think that if a displaced person is to come to this country, he should be processed by our representatives on the IRO.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the IRO is not our organization. Why should not a displaced person be processed by a branch of our own Government?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not take issue with the Senator's statement; but it seems to me that in the case of such persons who apply for admission into the United States, American officials in the IRO should be used from the beginning.

If the Senator will bear with me, let me state my reason in that connection: Let us assume that the four of us are, respectively, English, French, Canadian, and American; let us assume that there are four displaced persons who are applying for admission to one or another of our countries. If I had the right of selection as between those four persons, it would be very easy for me to take the best one of them for admission into my own country, and to assign the questionable ones to the other countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. But the present practice is worse than that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly the system should be arranged in such a way that the burden is equal and the caliber of the persons admitted to the various countries is more or less equal.

I am afraid that if an American in the IRO organization does not have contacts with applicants for admission into the United States the United States may get the dregs. That assumption may be unfounded, but it is a natural assumption.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not unfounded; it is mild, when compared to the present situation.

In the committee bill we have adopted the procedure which is used by the French, the Australians, and almost all other countries, namely, that our own citizens shall have the right to determine who shall be admitted into our country.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has asked me to state the differences between the two bills. The next great difference is as follows: After an application for admission to the United States clears the Displaced Persons Commission, to which it goes first, it then goes to the Immigration Service and to the consular service. The consular service and the Immigration Service have the right to veto each other in the case of the applications of ordinary immigrants; if either one of them thinks the applicant does not meet the test, either one of them can veto the other. However, in the case of applications for admission to the United States as displaced persons, the consular service and the Immigration Service are bound by the findings of the Displaced Persons Commission and of the IRO. Mr. L'Heureux, who is in charge of the Visa Division—I understand that the Senator from New York denies that Mr. L'Heureux did it; I do not know—came before the committee several times and said that he could veto the Immigration Commission and the Immigration Commission could veto him or his organization. He said that in many cases when a displaced person who is an applicant for admission into the United States appears before one of our consuls, although the consul knows that the applicant's documents are forged, and knows that the applicant was not in Germany on the cut-off date stated in the law, nevertheless, the consul is helpless. He may send the file back to the Displaced Persons Commission, but the findings of the Displaced Persons Commission are final.

Under the bill we gave the consul the exact authority he has relative to the Immigration Service, namely, that he can veto such an application if he does not think the applicant meets the test.

Third, in the case of agricultural preferences, there is a difference between the two bills.

The fourth difference between the two bills—and I think this one is the subject of the controversy—it is as follows: Under the Kilgore-Lehman-Ferguson substitute, if a displaced person was persecuted in Germany, and therefore went to another country and settled there, although not permanently, that person could return to Germany, and then could come into the United States as a displaced person. That provision is not included in the committee bill, for the reason that if such person is in another country and has his home there, he is taken care of; and there are in Germany now too many deserving persons who do not have homes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for the information.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to yield, but I have already agreed to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to defer to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has been discussing with the Senator from Maryland, as I understand, existing conditions in Europe in respect to the institution of the proceedings by which a displaced person makes application for admission to the United States. I understand that all the troubles we have had in that connection arise under the present law. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. EASTLAND. The troubles are due to direct violations of the present law.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. In any event, those who are operating the organization in Europe are operating it under the law the Congress passed last year. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. They are operating under the guise of that law; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. How would the Senator's bill protect us from these troubles?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have outlined how the committee bill protects in that situation.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry that I did not hear all the Senator's statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the bill, the authority is retained in the Displaced Persons Commission. But under the law which we passed, it was not contemplated—and the debate so shows—that the Displaced Persons Commission would administer the program in Europe. The Displaced Persons Commission was limited to finding houses and jobs for those persons and places where they would stay. But the Displaced Persons Commission has been given this authority by Executive order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that the only point I am trying to make is that if the Displaced Persons Commission is operating illegally in Europe and is not following the intent of Congress, that is one thing, of course.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is right; that is what is happening.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator says that is correct, I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; it is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator says it is, of course, I accept his statement.

I regret to have to ask these questions; I regret that I did not hear all the Senator's statement.

How does this bill correct that situation? let me ask the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. It corrects it by screening. It provides that no one but an American citizen shall process the applicants or shall have anything to do with the admission of such persons into the United States. It gives the consular service and the Immigration Service an additional veto. It takes the IRO entirely out of the matter. It takes care of one of the big sources of fraud, because under the two bills the cut-off date is the same.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. It occurred to me, from what I had heard informally about the Displaced Persons Act, that the present act itself is fairly satisfactory, and that what the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators who take his viewpoint are attempting to do is to defeat the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators.

Of course, the Senator knows how difficult a time we have had during the past year in trying to get any action of any kind in the way of securing the adoption of an amendment to the Displaced Persons Act. I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Nevada would have come in with this kind of an amendment to the pending bill if the House had not passed the bill it did pass.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, a year ago I announced that I favored a reasonable Displaced Persons Act. Certainly we have gone into the matter in a judicial way, to try to work out the very best bill it is possible to devise to

protect this country. In my State there are a great many families of displaced persons, and they are doing well. They are good people. A family of displaced persons is working as servants where I live, and they are satisfied.

I want a bill that is fair to every type and class and every religious group. Certainly religion should not have anything to do with this matter. Every form of discrimination has been eliminated. But we should protect this country from Communist agents.

Mr. LUCAS. I am all for that.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know the Senator is. I tell him that when he carefully goes over—as I know he will—the substitute and the committee bill, he will be startled at the similarity between the two bills. In their main features, with respect to bringing in displaced persons, they are the same.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator was discussing with the Senator from Maryland a certain individual who is in charge of a displaced persons camp in Germany. Will the Senator give me the name of that individual?

Mr. EASTLAND. Donald W. Main, the senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission in the Munich area of Germany.

Mr. LUCAS. Was he appointed by the Displaced Persons Commission in America?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. He is in charge. Is he the individual who is responsible for the failure of the committee to carry out the law in Germany?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. Others have testified—I do not know whether he was one of those who testified—that in an office employing nine people, seven of them went to the coordinator, Mr. Squadrilli, to protest that they were being made to do something contrary to the law, that the security of this country was not being protected, and that the matter was outrageous.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is Mr. Squadrilli?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Squadrilli is a coordinator. He is the head man in Europe, transferred from UNRRA.

Mr. LUCAS. From what country does he come?

Mr. EASTLAND. The United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Is he an American citizen?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, yes. But he told them to do as they were told. It shows that, the way the thing is there administered, the selectors never even see the persons they select to come here. They have protested that they could neither see them nor interview them, and that they were told, "If you don't like what we are doing, get out."

Mr. LUCAS. It seems very strange to the Senator from Illinois to find Americans in this zone deliberately ignoring the files of individuals making application to enter this country, applicants whom they know to be Communists or to have been associated with subversive elements, or who have some sort of criminal record. Can the Senator tell me why those who are presumed to be good Americans permit a thing of that kind?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot tell what is in a man's mind, of course, but the testimony respecting Russian agents and saboteurs, of course, does not come from those men. It came in one instance from the head of certain phases of military intelligence in Germany. They raise these questions; they tell us what is happening. We have done the best we could, in our feeble way, to correct the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator has. I know the Senator is most sincere in what he is trying to do with respect to the Displaced Persons Act. But in view of the fact that the Senator has said the military agency in Germany has given information to the committee with respect to this matter let me ask the further question: Did the military agency give similar information to the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot answer that question, but I will give the Senator a sample of what has happened. I hold in my hand an intelligence file which was approved by General Clay. It was sent to Washington. A high official who read the file stated that, if it were made public, there would be serious repercussions in the Halls of Congress. Here is the file. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for weeks, has asked that he be permitted to make the file public. He has been told it could not be made public. If the Senator from Illinois desires to read this confidential file, I think his eyes would be opened as to what is happening in the administration of the law. There it is.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois will try to read the secret file a little later on, in order that he may have his eyes opened. I had thought his eyes were open all the time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Here is something else.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask a question on that matter?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. But I have not finished answering the previous question.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Here is an officer in charge of military intelligence in Germany, who formerly had been stationed in Berlin. He was questioned:

Question. Colonel, do you know of cases where there were adverse security reports on displaced persons, but in which cases they were brought to this country, notwithstanding the adverse security reports?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

Question. I did not understand whether the Colonel thinks that investigation would disclose that, among the persons who have come over as displaced persons, are Communists.

The WITNESS. I am sure of it, sir.

That is a sample. This man testified that, through his organization in Berlin, he caught Russian officers and Communist agents who were trying to slip into this country as displaced persons, and that when those Russian officers were arrested, the Russians, by way of retaliation, arrested two American officers, whom they held for 6 months.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Kilgore substitute take care of that situation?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it does not.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator said there was practically no difference between the two proposals.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will state the difference in that respect. The thing is initiated by the International Refugee Organization. The file is compiled by the Displaced Persons Commission. It goes to a senior officer there, who is a Canadian, a Dutchman, or a Frenchman. This country would be better protected under the committee bill, because our own agency would do the selecting, an American citizen would compile the pertinent information, and furthermore, the consul, in case he did not think a person qualified under the act, could veto the application. That is the difference.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understood the Senator a moment ago, he stated that so far as discrimination in the matter of restrictions was concerned—a thing about which many Senators have become somewhat alarmed—the committee bill and the substitute bill are practically the same, but, so far as——

Mr. EASTLAND. In regard to the admission of displaced persons, I said they would both admit about the same number.

Mr. LUCAS. I see.

Mr. EASTLAND. I said the question was not whether we were for displaced persons or against them.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator from Missisippi that the Senator from Illinois wants the best type of processing and screening the Government of the United States can devise, so far as displaced persons are concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course the Senator from Illinois does. He is then confronted with this proposition. It is not a rumor, it is not hearsay. It is what witnesses have testified. This is the way the applicants are screened: When the file gets to the Displaced Persons Commission, a man's name is sent to the Berlin document center and to the provost marshal's office, to see what they have got on him. His fingerprints are sent to the fingerprint section in Berlin. But the Displaced Persons Commission does not even wait until the security report gets back. The officials testified, if the Senator will bear with me, that they took a calculated risk in order to hurry the entry of displaced persons into this country.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator would point out in the debate which one of the committee amendments will take care of the situation. I am very much interested in tightening up on all applications for entry to this country. Assuming the Senator's statement is correct with respect to the apparent manner in which they are being screened at the present

time, I think he should identify the amendment which will take care of the situation, and, when the amendent comes up on the floor of the Senate, I think the Senator again should identify it.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the very first amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. By the very first amendment, as I told the Senator, we would take the matter out of the hands of a foreign organization, out of the hands of displaced persons, and out of the hands of aliens. If I can find it, I should like to read to the Senator a report given to the Displaced Persons Commission about the bribery that was taking place in the International Refugee Organization.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can read all of that. The Senator has now read enough, assuming all the facts to be as he has stated them, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator wanted me to state exactly how we were remedying the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. This is the way we fix it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator need not read a report on bribery. I merely want to know how it is proposed to proceed, assuming bribery to exist.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Edward W. Glazek, in a report addressed to the Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission under date of May 11, 1949, among other things, said:

The issuance of documents from IRO has become a complete racket, and is unworthy of reliability. Individuals who normally could not qualify present false documents which are readily accepted, and often such individuals are coached by the IRO interviewers as to their fitness. If the prospective candidates do not possess documents, IRO has the authority to issue such on the mere statement of the individual under oath. The applicants are interviewed by clerks, and these documents are certified by IRO officers without direct contact with the candidates. This procedure offers an opportunity for widespread bribery and corruption.

Mr. LUCAS. That is merely a conclusion upon his part, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the reason we have taken IRO out of the bill.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to read the remainder of it. Mr. Cutler is employed by the Displaced Persons Commission in Germany, and he testified on the 6th of February, of this year. He said:

You must remember that the job of the International Refugee Organization is to get rid of displaced persons, as many and as soon as possible, no matter how. That is their job. The people who do the actual work are all displaced persons, practically all of them. There is an IRO eligibility officer. He accepts the work done by displaced persons, and he simply signs his signature.

Question. When the American consular officer gets a file on a displaced person, does the American consular officer, in addition, make an ascertainment as to whether or not the displaced person is eligible under the immigration law, and also make an ascertainment as to whether or not the applicant is an eligible displaced person?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. By whom is that done?

Answer. It is done by the IRO entirely.

Question. The IRO makes that determination through employees who are themselves displaced persons?

Answer. Yes, sir.

He testified further as follows:

The International Refugee Organization maintains a legal division to solicit pardons for convicted displaced persons so they may become eligible for immigration to the United States under the law.

We made a terrific improvement when we took IRO out of this picture. No other nation in the world uses it.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator not know that, in addition to the screening by the IRO, which is simply on the question of whether the displaced persons meet the definition of the constitution of the IRO, there is a further check of every DP by the United States Army's Counter-Intelligence Corps, by the State Department, through its consular service, and by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States, and that no DP can enter this country without such a check and without authority given by these agencies?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as I have shown, the IRO is shot through, so we have been told, with bribery and corruption, and I do not think the great United States of America, the greatest Nation on which God's sun ever shone, should be bound by a security report made by a foreign organization. Good American blood flows through my veins, and I cannot think that this country should be bound by a security report made by an international organization and that the files in Europe should be compiled by displaced persons who want to rush each other to this country.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. No better American blood flows through the veins of the Senator from Mississippi than that which flows through the veins of the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, I meant nothing personal by my statement, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I accept the explanation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New York is a great American, and I have the highest confidence in his integrity and ability.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The consular service and the Immigration Service do not have facilities abroad to make a widespread check. It has been testified that they are bound largely by the files sent them which have been compiled by displaced persons, and they largely act on that basis.

The Senator has mentioned a security check and security screening by the Displaced Persons Commission, and yet employees of that Commission say, "We do not even wait for security reports. We do not even wait for a security report from the provost marshal's office."

The man in charge of the fingerprint bureau says:

They send me fingerprints that are not even written in the English language. I cannot tell anything about them. Many of them are illegible.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment.

Here is a letter to the chairman of the committee from the fingerprint division, and I shall read the letter at this point:

The reason I am writing you is that I saw the enclosed clipping of an article which appeared in an Army newspaper, the Stars and Stripes, on Friday, the 13th of January. There is one particular sentence that interests me most:

"They are putting pressure on everybody and every single organization to pass everything."

In that connection, let me say that a high official of the Displaced Persons Commission testified he got a transfer because he had given adverse reports on DP's.

Let us see what is happening at the fingerprint center:

Since 1948 our section has been charged with processing the fingerprints of every DP requesting entry into the United States under the DP Act of 1948.

This is the man who fingerprints every applicant who comes in.

We have been under constant pressure to speed up the work. Many of the fingerprints we receive for processing are taken in such a haphazard manner as to render them useless to us.

Mr. President, there is the screening of which the Senator from New York speaks of.

Many of the fingerprints we receive for processing are taken in such a haphazard manner as to render them useless to us. It is therefore practically impossible to check these for any previous conviction. The signature of the person taking the prints is invariably that of a displaced person.

That bears out what one official said, that an applicant does not even see an American citizen until he gets down to the consul. That is the first time he looks into the eyes of an American citizen.

Any notations made as to missing fingers, scars in the pattern area, etc., is usually in such poor English that it is incomprehensible. When for some reason one of the fingers is not printed, a notation should be made as to the reason. This is hardly ever done. Despite this, I don't believe there are ever any prints returned by our office to the contributors for retaking.

When they are illegible, Mr. President, and are sent back with the statement, "They are illegible; send me some more prints which have been taken again," they are never sent back.

Our office has concentrated almost solely on DP prints. Therefore, the fingerprints

of any person arrested for a criminal offense stand a very good chance of not even being in file.

In spite of my repeated protests, it has been made clear to me and to the other members of our section by our section chief that what mattered was production rather than accuracy.

Please note that: The section chief says that accuracy does not matter. It is production that counts. He tells them they need not even be accurate. There, Mr. President, is the screening. There is the security check. That is what is being done to protect our country.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be happy to yield when I have finished reading the letter.

However, I feel that the American people are entitled to know that the DP's are not receiving the security screening (as far as fingerprints are concerned) that the American public may think.

There is a man who says the DP's are not receiving the screening which the American public may think they are receiving. Oh, no, there is no propaganda machine, with a lobby to spend millions of dollars, talking about screening displaced persons to protect the country!

Mr. President, the testimony of the men who administer the program shows that they agree almost unanimously that the United States is not being protected. That bears out the statements of numerous Senators who have been in Europe and have seen at first hand conditions in this field.

I read further:

I should like to make it clear that I am not against the DP Act itself. I am against the abuse of it. I hope that some day I may have the pleasure of meeting you in person.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. In view of the fact that the able Senator from Mississippi has denied the accuracy of my statement that these people are screened by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and by the State Department, I made inquiry as late as this morning——

Mr. EASTLAND. Right there, Mr. President, I may say this is not a personal matter of my word against the word of the Senator from New York, or of the Senator's word against anyone else's word. I have simply read the statements made by officers who administer the program, and those statements speak for themselves. If the Senator from New York has some statements which deny the truth of the statements which I have read, the Senator may refer to them in his own time. He may put that information in the RECORD if he wishes. It is certainly proper to do so in this debate, and it should by all means be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the junior Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator object to my reading the result of my inquiry from the Commissioner of Immigration of the United States and from the Chief of the Visa Division of the United States at this time, in order to clarify the situation?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator may read that a little later, when I have finished reading the testimony. I should like to get in the RECORD all the testimony that bears on the question.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if he does not believe that in all fairness, in order that the RECORD may be as complete and full as possible, he should accede to the request of the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. The senior Senator from New York evidently does not understand what has happened, when he challenges anyone's fairness. I stated that I had the testimony of a number of witnesses on the point I was discussing and that I desired to put all the testimony in the RECORD. I said that I would yield to the Senator from New York after I had put the testimony in the RECORD. I think I am being most fair. I should like to get the testimony in, and then I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from New York, so that he may make a speech in my time, if he wishes. I believe fairness lies in that suggestion. I do not believe it is fair to jump up in the middle of the reading of testimony, when only part of the testimony has been read, and ask me to yield for another purpose.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again to the senior Senator from New York?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York understood that the junior Senator from New York was endeavoring to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement which he said would clarify the situation to a considerable extent.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what he said. As the senior Senator from New York well knows, I stated that I had other testimony which bore on the point, and that when I had placed that testimony in the RECORD, I would permit the junior Senator from New York to place his material in the RECORD.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York is very grateful to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is nothing to be grateful about. I did not agree to do it because the senior Senator from New York requested it. I had agreed to do it before the senior Senator from New York rose to make the request.

I now read further from the testimony of Mr. Main:

Question. Are these people in the IRO who make their determinations on those two points in some instances citizens of countries other than the United States?

Mr. MAIN. I think in most instances.

Question. What countries are they citizens of, for the most part?

Mr. MAIN. They are what they class "I" employees of IRO, which includes English, Dutch, Canadian, and all participants of IRO, I think.

Question. To what extent are the records of IRO, which you receive, prepared by displaced persons themselves?

Mr. MAIN. Almost all of the records, the documentation received, is prepared by displaced persons employed by IRO.

Question. In connection with the documentation that you receive from IRO, on which it makes determinations and decisions binding upon the Commission, the records are prepared by displaced persons themselves, is that correct?

Mr. MAIN. The records themselves are usually prepared by displaced persons.

The certifications, however, are in the names of class I employees, not displaced persons.

Mr. Almanza Tripp, whom I have previously identified as the officer in charge of the immigration detail stationed in Europe to examine displaced persons, testified in public session before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on February 15, 1950, as follows:

Question. Now, Mr. Tripp, to continue: Who prepares the IRO records which are certified to the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. TRIPP. Do you mean the resettlement form and similar documents?

Question. Yes.

Mr. TRIPP. They are prepared by displaced persons employed by the IRO.

Question. In other words, is it true that the certifications which go from the International Refugee Organization to the Displaced Persons Commission are prepared, that is, the files are prepared, by displaced persons themselves?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes; they are. But the certification is by one of their international employees.

Question. But he just signs his name to a document which has been prepared by other displaced persons; is that true?

Mr. TRIPP. I believe so, in most cases.

Question. Now, when the displaced persons have prepared this document which has been certified by their officer and transmitted to the Displaced Persons Commission, does the Displaced Persons Commission, in the usual run of cases, accept the certification of this document which was prepared by the displaced persons themselves?

Mr. TRIPP. To the best of my knowledge, they do.

Mr. President, there is the testimony of the man who is at the head of the immigration detail stationed in Europe. The Senator from New York says that the displaced persons are screened, actually screened, by the Displaced Persons Commission. This gentleman says that that certification is usually accepted by the Displaced Persons Commission without question. He says a certification and file made up by displaced persons and certified to by an alien, is accepted when it gets to the Displaced Persons Commission. I read further:

Question. In other words, we have a situation where displaced persons are preparing documents which, as the practice is, are

binding upon the representatives of the Government?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes.

I call that to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President. Here are representatives of a foreign organization who in practice make documents which are binding on the representatives of our Government.

Now here is the testimony of Mr. Edward M. Glasek, who was formerly employed by the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe. This is a report dated May 11, 1949, addressed to the Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission. The Senator from New York says that the displaced persons are screened by IRO. Here is a report to the President of the Displaced Persons Commission. Listen to this:

Issuance of documents by IRO has become a complete racket and is unworthy of reliability.

"A complete racket and is unworthy of reliability." Where is the screening? Where is the security check?

Individuals who normally could not qualify present false documents which are readily accepted and often such individuals are coached by the IRO interviewers as to their answers. If the prospective candidates do not possess documents, IRO has the authority to issue such on the mere statement of the individual under oath. The applicants are interviewed by indigenous clerks and these documents are certified by IRO officers without a direct contact with the candidates. This procedure offers an opportunity for widespread bribery and corruption.

Mr. President, there is a report made nearly a year ago, and no steps have been taken by the Displaced Persons Commission to remedy that situation.

I quote further from Mr. Tripp:

Question. I want to get this crystal clear for the record. On the basis of your observations and experience and the work over there as chief of the immigration service in Europe, is it not a fact that the administration of the Displaced Persons Commission, or the people in key position over there, are people who have been formerly associated with UNRRA or with voluntary agencies?

Mr. TRIPP. The majority of them.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said in 1948, when the present law was under consideration, that if UNRRA employees would have anything to do with this administration, he would be opposed to it, yet many such UNRRA employees were transferred to key positions in the Displaced Persons Commission.

Question. Which voluntary agencies are those trying to get displaced persons over here in this country? Is that correct?

Mr. TRIPP. That is correct.

Mr. President, testimony before the committee by field employees of the Displaced Persons Commission and by the officer in charge of the immigration detail in Europe described numerous instances of pressure by officers of the Displaced Persons Commission in every phase of the operation. This pressure is exerted not only on the employees of the Commission, but upon the United States consuls and upon the immigration officers. Seven out of nine employees in the office under one area director, who had formerly been associated with a voluntary agency, went to the European theater to protest, but they were transferred.

Note, Mr. President, that seven out of nine employees in the office of one area director who had formerly been associated with a voluntary agency went to the European headquarters to protest what had been done. But no attempt was made to protect our country, Mr. President. These men were transferred because they attempted to do so.

One field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission testified with respect to the action of a senior officer of the Commission who had sought a pardon for a convicted displaced person in order to make him eligible for immigration to the United States. Think of that—a senior officer of the Commission obtaining a pardon for a criminal so he could make him eligible to come here.

Another field employee testified that approximately 50 percent of his rejections of ineligible displaced persons were overruled. Think of that. There is a field employee who said that in 50 percent of the cases which he had rejected as being ineligible, he was overruled by others higher up.

Another field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission presented to the committee numerous files of cases in which he had been directed to whitewash ineligible displaced persons. Think of that, Mr. President. Another employee brought before the committee numerous files to show that he had been directed to whitewash ineligible displaced persons so they could come to this country.

The officer in charge of the immigration detail in Europe, Mr. Tripp, testified that the officers of the Displaced Persons Commission requested him to refrain from interrogating applicants concerning their eligibility under the displaced-persons law so that there would be fewer cases for investigation.

Another one said he went to interview certain persons to ascertain their eligibility, but was directed not to do so, in order that they would not have so many cases to investigate. There is a sample of the screening, Mr. President.

I desire to apologize to the Senator from New York. I told him that when I had finished the reading of the testimony I would let him place a memorandum in the RECORD. I am not through with the testimony, but in my prepared text I have found some arguments in which I do not quote from testimony.

Mr. President, provided I do not lose the floor, I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from New York to place in the RECORD the memorandum to which he referred, and then I shall return to a reading of the testimony of other witnesses.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his courtesy and consideration. I believe my statement will serve to clarify the question of the authority and the effectiveness of screening.

The Senator from Mississippi stated yesterday, and again today, that the Immigration Service and the consular service do not have a veto on the entry of displaced persons into the United States.

I have made inquiry of the Commissioner of Immigration, Mr. Watson B. Miller, an able and outstanding public servant, and he has advised me that the Commissioner of Immigration, through his agents and employees in Europe and through his agents and employees at Ellis Island, has and exercises final jurisdiction on the admission into the United States of displaced persons insofar as these persons qualify or fail to qualify under the immigration laws of the United States. This includes the provisions of the law on moral turpitude, political background, health, and many other restrictions placed upon all immigrants seeking to enter the United States. After the Displaced Persons Commission has forwarded the files of an individual eligible under the standards of the Displaced Persons Commission, the Commissioner of Immigration has the authority, which he exercises, to bar people from entering the United States who do not have the qualifications which are called for under the immigration laws. The Immigration Commissioner may even inquire into and investigate—and does—the facts of eligibility under the displaced-persons law, and may remand to the Displaced Persons Commission such cases regarding which the Immigration Commissioner has doubt as to qualification under the current construction of the Displaced Persons Act. It is true that the Displaced Persons Commission, under the terms of a gentleman's agreement with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, has the final word on this field of eligibility and may determine, after further investigation, that the applicant does actually qualify under the definition of a displaced person. But in regard to all other aspects of immigration eligibility, the Commissioner of Immigration has the final word. In practice, the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Immigration is exercised after the issuance of the visa by the consular service. All this, of course, is set forth in section 10 of the Displaced Persons Act, which I urge the Members of the Senate to read. I should like the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert that section into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I object to it being placed in the RECORD at this point. I do not object to the Senator having it placed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say that I am entirely agreeable to the suggestion by the Senator from Mississippi that I place the section in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's speech.

Mr. EASTLAND. Has the Senator concluded his statement respecting what Mr. Watson B. Miller advised him?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I have not entirely completed it. I shall conclude it in a moment.

The Commissioner of Immigration has 20 employees and agents engaged in this work in Europe. In addition to these, there are the regular immigration officials at Ellis Island and other points of

entry where displaced persons may be refused entry—and sometimes are—on the basis of facts not originally known which would bar these displaced persons from entry into the United States under the immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. President, this statement has been read to the Commissioner of Immigration, and he has advised me that what I have said is in accord with the facts.

Mr. President, with the further indulgence of the able Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a moment, please. Has the Senator concluded his statement respecting what Mr. Miller advised him?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. I have not stated what Mr. L'Heureux advised me.

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to answer Mr. Miller's statement, and then the Senator from New York can place Mr. L'Heureux's statement in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, what I said yesterday, and what I have said today, which I am quite confident the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will bear out, is that on matters of eligibility or cut-off date the findings of the Displaced Persons Commission are final; that matters under the general immigration law, whether a person qualifies under the immigration law or not, can be vetoed by the Immigration Service. I said yesterday and I have said today, and I am absolutely sure the RECORD will bear me out, that when the consular service or the Immigration Service have information which leads them to believe a man has come fraudulently into the zones he is not eligible to come into, that that file goes back to the Displaced Persons Commission, but that the decision of the Displaced Persons Commission is final; that it cannot be overruled by the consul and cannot be overruled by the immigration officials. For that reason we placed in the bill the provision that the Displaced Persons Commission could be overruled by the consular service. I emphasize what I said yesterday, and what I have said today, which the RECORD will certainly verify, that that is the system which is used.

Yesterday I placed in the RECORD the rule promulgated by the Displaced Persons Commission, and I shall read it again:

> The report shall be deemed to establish prima facie the applicant's history and eligibility under the act and shall be deemed to establish as conclusive—

"As conclusive," Mr. President—

> the existence of all factors relating to eligibility to enter the United States, except existence of those factors required in applicable immigration laws other than the act.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am perfectly willing to allow the record to speak for itself, in view of the fact that the statement I have just read definitely refutes the claim made—not once, but many times—by the senior Senator from Mississippi that the final word with regard to the admission of displaced persons and all other would-be immigrants to the United States does not lie with the Immigration Service, under the immigration law.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it does, under the immigration law. But under the Displaced Persons Act, the Displaced Persons Commission has the final authority and decision.

Mr. LEHMAN. But it is perfectly clear, from the statement I have presented, that it does not.

Mr. President, with the further indulgence of the able Senator from Mississippi, I should like to state that I have also made inquiry of Mr. L'Heureux, the Chief of the Visa Division, who affirms, without question, that the consular service has, and exercises, final jurisdiction over the issuance of visas to displaced persons, insofar as the laws applicable to the issuance of visas are concerned. The consuls may and do reject displaced persons who do not qualify under the laws governing admissibility of immigrants, where the Foreign Service is given, by law, jurisdiction over such admissibility. All this is set forth in title 8 of the United States Code, where it may be read by all Senators who desire clarification on this point.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will pardon me, let me say that he misinterprets his own documents and letters in that respect. Of course, under the Immigration Act and the administration of that act in connection with the general immigration laws, the Immigration Service is responsible, and has authority. We have not changed that situation. In that respect, the word of the consul and the word of the immigration official are final; and they can veto each other, if they wish to do so.

But in regard to the question of who is a displaced person, and whether an applicant for admission into the United States as a displaced person was in Germany on the cut-off date, and whether he comes within the IRO categories, neither the consular official nor the immigration official can veto the findings of the officials of the Displaced Persons Commission. The findings of the officials of the Displaced Persons Commission are final.

That is why Mr. L'Heureux asked the Judiciary Committee to give to the consular service and to the Immigration Service that additional authority. His statements are in the record. If those Services now have that authority, as the Senator from New York says they have, then why does he object to having such a provision included in this bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Mississippi has asked me the question, let me say that the entire thesis of his argument, since yesterday afternoon, has been that subversives are coming into this country because of the complacency, or worse, of the Displaced Persons Commission. I have maintained, and the Senator from Mississippi has denied, that the final decision with regard to the admissibility of displaced persons and all other immigrants, as far as their political background is concerned and on many other factors rests in the Immigration and Naturalization Service and in the State Department.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, either the distinguished Senator from New York misunderstood me or I misunderstood him. I said that if a person is a Communist, the Immigration Service and the consular service can veto his application, when it reaches them. But, as a matter of practice, it does not work out that way, because the consul has before him only the file for that person. The consul cannot act intelligently on a file that is prepared by displaced persons. Especially is that true when there was an order to remove adverse reports from the file, before the file reached the consular service. That is the whole purport of what I said.

If I told the Senate that the consular service could not veto the application of a displaced person whom it knew to be a Communist, I was certainly in error, because the consular service can veto such applications. But my point was that it does not have facilities with which to make the necessary investigations, and the Displaced Persons Commission has taken what it calls a calculated risk. It sends the file on before it receives a report from the Berlin document center or from the Provost Marshal's office; and it takes what it describes as a calculated risk that the man is not a bad character.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator that it is perfectly possible that he may have misunderstood me or that I may have misunderstood him. In order not to continue the colloquy, let me say that I am perfectly content to rest on the RECORD as it now stands.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if I said the consular service could not veto the application of a person known to be a Communist, I was certainly in error. I do not think I said that. I said that, as the procedure works out, the consul is bound by the file, because all the information he has is contained in the file, and there has been no screening as to it. The whole purpose is to avoid screening and to rush the displaced persons into the United States. That is the situation which the consular service is attempting to rectify.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New York will listen to this: For violations of the Displaced Persons Act, the consul and the Immigration Service have no veto power at all, except under the general immigration law.

Mr. President, Mr. Tripp further testified, with reference to representations which had been made to him, that the European coordinator of the Displaced Persons Commission, who formerly was with UNRRA, had solicited certain persons to complain of Mr. Tripp's administration of the Immigration Service in Germany. A field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission testified that a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission, who was formerly with one of the voluntary agencies, stated at a staff meeting to the field employees that if they could not reconcile certain irregularities with their consciences, they should quit the job.

Just think of that, Mr. President. A senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission told the men working under him, "If you cannot reconcile irregularities with your conscience, quit your job."

Then will Senators tell me that we should not tighten up the procedure in this matter? Will they tell me that we should not take steps to protect the United States?

Mr. President, another field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission testified before the committee with reference to a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission who formerly had been with a voluntary agency. He was asked:

Did Mr. Bashien indicate in this staff conference that he was the moving force which caused the transfer of the Counter-Intelligence Corps man who had been giving derogatory reports?

Just think of that, Mr. President. There was an intelligence officer, an officer of the American Secret Service, who is in the front line in the fight against Communist infiltration into the United States, a senior officer in the Army Intelligence Service, now stationed in Europe, a man who seeks to protect this country from infiltration by Russian agents who are attempting to get into the United States. That man gave some derogatory reports; and, as a result, the Displaced Persons Commission officials in Europe tried to have him transferred. In the face of that situation, Mr. President, how much importance should we attach to statements about screening and about security reports and about attempts to protect this country?

Mr. President, I shall repeat the question I previously read from the testimony:

Did Mr. Bashien indicate in this staff conference that he was the moving force which caused the transfer of the Counter-Intelligence Corps man who had been giving derogatory reports?

Mr. CRAIG. He did.

Question. What did he say on that point specifically, as you recall?

Mr. CRAIG. He said that the individual who had been giving these derogatory reports, that he had put pressure on, and that the individual who had been giving these derogatory reports had been transferred.

So, Mr. President, a man in the Counter-Intelligence Corps who had given derogatory reports on displaced persons was transferred, under pressure from a man named Bashien, employed by the Displaced Persons Commission. Mr. Bashien was an area director.

I read further from the testimony:

Question. He had put the pressure on whom?

Mr. CRAIG. On the Counter Intelligence Corps.

Mr. President, the testimony before the committee by field employees of the Displaced Persons Commission was to the effect that they had been ordered by the European headquarters of the Displaced Persons Commission to withdraw adverse reports from the files on cases which had been rejected, and that although in one area a letter indicating that the adverse reports had been withdrawn was inserted in the file, this was not the practice in other areas.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. As soon as I finish emphasizing this point, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, in all the areas but one, the employees of the Displaced Persons Commission were told to remove from the files the derogatory reports, so that the Consular officials or the Immigration officials would be fooled, when the files and reports got down the line. In only one area was a notation to the effect that such reports had been removed from the files included in the file. In all the other areas, no such notation was included in the files.

Mr. President, in all fairness, let me state that when Mr. Carusi reached Europe and found that that had been done, he exploded, and ordered that that should be changed.

But I submit that this country is being morally betrayed, and that we should not leave in charge, in Europe, a man who would try to put over such a system as that.

Now I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator, is it not a fact that the letter directing the withdrawal of those statements from the files stated, "This letter shall be included in the file"?

Mr. EASTLAND. My information is that that was true in one of the areas, as I said.

Mr. KILGORE. But did not the letter from the Frankfurt central office in one paragraph advise the area director to rewrite the report and to include the letter from the Frankfurt office as a part of the file?

Mr. EASTLAND. As I told the Senator, my information on this point, which may be in error, is that the letter went into the file in one of the areas, but it did not go into the files in other areas. That was my statement.

Mr. KILGORE. May I refresh the Senator's recollection?

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is speaking about the Munich area, I am confident. That is Mr. Main's area, in which Mr. Main, rewriting the report under the direction of the Frankfurt office, included in the report the fact that he had turned down the application. That is not the question I asked the Senator. It is true that Main did that, and that in the other areas it was not done. Is it not also a fact that the letter from the Frankfurt office directing withdrawal of the papers, also directed that the letter ordering the withdrawal of papers be included in the file, in order to give notice?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. Mr. Tripp who, as the Senator knows, was head of the immigration detail in Europe, testified it was put in the file in one of the areas, but that in the other areas he did not think the letter was placed in the files. That is as I remember the testimony. I am advised that that is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the Senator whether he will not include the full letter as a part of his remarks today?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has not been in the Chamber all the time. The letter in full was placed in the RECORD yesterday, and it has again been placed in the RECORD today.

Mr. KILGORE. That is fine. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND But, as I said——

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

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment. But, as I said in justice to Mr. Carusi, when he got to Europe, he stopped the practice. Mr. President, permit me to say I think Mr. Carusi is a good man. I have confidence in him. But I do not think he knows what is happening in Europe. I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from Mississippi said there was certainly moral deceit on the part of certain of the Displaced Persons Commission officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. In Europe.

Mr. JENNER. In Europe.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not impute any bad motive to any member of the Displaced Persons Commission, and I do not want anything I have said to be a reflection upon the integrity of any member of the Commission. I do not want to make that statement so far as the European theater is concerned. The best I can say, based on the testimony before me, is that there is gross negligence there.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator from Mississippi know of the moral deceit in connection with an IRO interoffice communication or memorandum dated November 8, 1949?

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to have it.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an air-mail envelope sent from IRO headquarters in Europe, addressed to "Senator P. MCCARRAN, Senator from Nevada, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., United States of America." It is from the International Refugee Organization. Enclosed in this envelope is a communication reading as follows:

Interoffice memorandum.

Addressed to: Mr. C. C. K.—Grierson-Rickford.

Date: November 8, 1949.

Subject: Public information release plans for United States program reduction.

Without taking the Senator's time, I may say this long memorandum contains a résumé of facts, namely, that when Congress adjourned last year without amending the Displaced Persons Act, the International Refugee Organization had thrown upon it the burden of beginning to process agricultural displaced persons, as it should have done under the law, but which it had failed to do, selecting only such displaced persons as they wanted, without regard to the law of the United States, and that when the displaced-persons bill was amended during the last session, they were then up against it, because they were away behind in their agricultural quotas. That is the gist of the memorandum. For the Senator's information, let me read the salient points:

(1) At a meeting between the Displaced Persons Commission and public information

officers this afternoon, the following plans were agreed to for the release of information about the production of United States shipping, visaing, etc., during the coming months.

(a) On or about the 20th day of December, a straight-faced announcement to be made on shipping schedule planned for the month of January;

(b) On the 24th day of December, Mr. Rosenfield will arrive in New York with the bad news, making appropriate comment as to the reasons for the reduction in production and transportation of persons for the United States;

(c) Early an January, the IRO, on the basis of stimulus, either natural or arranged, will release more detailed information as to—

(i) Why the shipping schedule has been cut.

(ii) What effect this cut will have on the total program.

(iii) The number of persons being held up who might otherwise depart had not these agricultural percentages been applied.

This referred to a law of the United States. They are planning and scheming to smear that law, and to explain why they have not lived up to it. Note the climax:

(2) It was mutually decided that it was to our best interests not to release the information too early, but felt impact could best be felt when Congress reconvenes on January 3, and when the Congressmen are more sensitive to the New York and Washington press.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a powerful document.

Mr. JENNER. I emphasized the statement I just read. It is signed by Mr. Warren G. Fuller, Assistant Director of Resettlement, with a copy to Miss Wilson.

Mr. EASTLAND. In other words, Mr. President, the organization is to bring pressure on Congress. I may say, had the organization spent as much time attempting to enforce the program and to get desirable persons into this country as they have spent in schemes to break the law, we would be in much better shape.

Mr. JENNER. But here is the Displaced Persons Commission conniving with the information officers of the IRO to bring pressure on the Congress at the strategic time, so that they can sell their program.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is conniving with the outfit which has its lawyers in this country soliciting pardons for criminals.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. I want to bring out the fact that, in addition to moral deceit on the part of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe, certainly there is moral deceit on the part of displaced persons in the IRO, who are selecting persons who are to become the future citizens of this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. I think that should go in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point for an inquiry addressed to the Senator from Indiana, did the Senator from Indiana place the entire letter in the RECORD?

Mr. JENNER. No; I have not put the entire letter in the RECORD yet.

Mr. EASTLAND. I stated I thought the entire letter should be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. JENNER. If I do not put it in the RECORD today, I should like to put it in after I have an opportunity of saying a few things about the program referred to in the letter.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have just read the testimony to the effect that officials of the Displaced Persons Commission had an officer of the Central Intelligence Corps transferred, because he gave derogatory information in connection with the entrance of displaced persons.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Counter Intelligence Corps is an arm of the military government in Germany, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore, it is not under the direction of the Displaced Persons Commission, is it?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. It is under the direction of the head of the military government of Germany, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. But that does not change the situation, when senior officers put heat on the Counter-Intelligence Corps to get a man transferred who was giving adverse security reports.

Mr. President, the testimony given before our committee by field representatives of the Displaced Persons Commission was to the effect that they had been ordered by the European headquarters of the Displaced Persons Commission to withdraw adverse reports from the files on cases which had been rejected, and we have have, as to one area, a letter indicating that an adverse report had been withdrawn. The letter was inserted in the file. Mr. John W. Cutler, Jr., who was a field employee of the Displaced Persons Commission, testified before the committee as follows:

Mr. CUTLER. What I want to say is that the reason I have come over here and jeopardized my position—and I want to say now that I have a very good job, as far as salary is concerned; I make more money than I made before in my position and my wife and I are perfectly happy in Germany, but the fact is that things like this and the steady pressure on everybody to pass everyone, pass him, no matter how—if you cannot prove it, pass it—it has been that way in every bit of the whole organization. That is not only in the DP organization, but it spreads down to the lowest DP clerk, the selector, the analyst, and even the senior officer. The reason I say that is that originally, in Butzbach, four of us had gone to Butzbach to complain—

Butzbach is the location of the head of one of the area organizations—

before this thing took place, before the VVN, and we had been told that we had no right to question what our superior officer told us and we had no right to reject anybody—

They went to complain about the VVN, which, as I shall show, is a Communist organization—

that if we wanted to reject somebody, we had to hand the case over to him, and he could overrule us at any time.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. Something has been brought up regarding the CIC, and I should like the Senator to explain to the Members of the Senate what security checks there are for the protection of this Nation as to a displaced person who tells the American officials or the IRO that he came from some other address in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, or some other nation of that kind.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is really no adequate check, as the Senator knows.

Mr. JENNER. There is no way such persons can be checked, is there?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. JENNER. So long as the IRO and the Displaced Persons Commission say these people are qualified as displaced persons, there is nothing the Immigration Service or the Consular Service can do about it in protecting the American Government. They have to let them come in. Is not that a fact?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what is happening.

Mr. Tripp testified that approximately 30,000 persons who had come in thus far were of doubtful eligibility. That is a startling figure to come from the Immigration Service.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. Tripp testified that more than 30,000 had already entered. I ask the Senator how many have already come in?

Mr. EASTLAND. I should judge, from 130,000 to 135,000.

Mr. JENNER. Then, under the present law, if that same percentage prevails, of the 205,000 there will be approximately 40,000 to 50,000 displaced persons in this country who are doubtful security risks, according to Mr. Tripp, who is the head of the Immigration Service detail in Europe. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Who are of doubtful security risk and who are ineligible under the law.

Mr. JENNER. There is no difference, I believe the Senator has stated, between the two bills in regard to numbers. One provides for 339,000 and the other for approximately 330,000. Unless the Senate does something to tighten up the security risk we shall project the same percentage of doubtful risks into an additional 120,000 persons over the 205,000 under the present law, which means that, under the same percentage of operation, we would have approximately 70,000 or 80,000 displaced persons in America who, according to Mr. Tripp, who is an authority in this field, are doubtful security risks.

Mr. EASTLAND. I say to my distinguished friend from Indiana that if this is not changed—and the committee bill is the only pending change—we had just as well junk any attempts to pass security legislation. It would amount to nothing, when an official in charge of phases of military intelligence says that Russian officers are being smuggled into

this country. If we cannot stop that, we might as well junk any attempt to pass security legislation.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has passed the point to which I wanted to refer. He stated that no one checked any person from Poland or Czechoslovakia, for instance, to see whether the person had resided at an address behind the iron curtain in previous years. I ask the Senator whether the Immigration Service could check behind the iron curtain.

Mr. EASTLAND. That point is reached very simply in the committee bill. I have here the official Counter-Intelligence Corps reports, three of them, which show fraud in admitting persons to this country, which the Counter-Intelligence Corps found in spot checks. The way that is reached is that the cut-off date was in 1945. One town was checked, and it was found that the people were lining up at night to see the registrar, and it was proved that he was admitting great numbers of persons who had settled there the previous year. It could be proved by check that those people were not in Germany at the time of the cut-off date. Therefore we reach great numbers of frauds by taking IRO out of the picture. As the Senator knows, officials of the Displaced Persons Commission say that IRO's reports are unreliable and that bribery is widespread. Why should they not be taken out?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think the Senator has answered my question. Even though the change would place the Immigration Service in absolute charge of determining who is a displaced person, who is a qualified displaced person—"eligible displaced person" are the words used—how would they go behind the iron curtain to check up on residences, dates, and so forth?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not make myself clear. Of course they cannot go behind the iron curtain. But here is a man who says he had registered in Butzbach in September 1945. Investigation shows that he registered there in 1948. We do not have to go behind the iron curtain. The information can be obtained largely in Germany.

Mr. FERGUSON. The act says that is a fraud and that the person is not an eligible displaced person. The Immigration Service could deny his entry into this country. If the law were followed, there would be a denial of his entry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the whole controversy, as has been stated time and again, is a question of screening. Proper investigations are not being made. There is no adequate system of screening. That is exactly what the committee bill attempts to remedy, and that is all. The consular officers and the immigration officers have a file prepared by IRO. It is information compiled for displaced persons, and of course they cannot act on it.

I refer further to Mr. Cutler's testimony.

Question. Who would overrule you?

Mr. CUTLER. The senior officer.

Mr. President, he had just testified that if they wanted to reject someone, they were to send the file to him, and he could overrule them.

Mr. Cutler continues:

Shortly after this, that is, four of us from our organization at Butzbach—and there were about six there at the time, at the same time, or shortly thereafter——

Question. Where did you four go, the four that you make reference to? You said you went somewhere.

Mr. CUTLER. We went to Frankfurt.

Question. To do what?

Mr. CUTLER. To complain about the existing situation. At that time we were concerned with the fact that we were not allowed to see the displaced persons we selected.

Mr. President, should not a displaced-person selector see the people whom he selects? They went to complain because they were not permitted to do that.

I quote further from his testimony:

In doubtful cases we wished to be able to interview the applicant to see if by a personal investigation, interview, we could determine certain facts: and we were told we could not. Now, in the Munich area, for instance, that is the one area that I know, you have always been allowed to interview applicants of doubtful character.

But they would not let him do that in his area.

Shortly thereafter, seven people, seven members of the Ludwigsburg mission, went to Frankfurt for more or less the same reason, to the best of my knowledge.

Question. What did your group of four do when they went to Frankfurt?

Mr. CUTLER. We asked Mr. Squadrilli—

He is the chief man in Europe—

if we would not be permitted to see certain DP applicants about which questions had been raised regarding their eligibility.

Question. Was that their eligibility or their loyalty?

Mr. CUTLER. That was at that time their eligibility. That was very early in the program. Two months after the commencement of the program. In Ludwigsburg seven members of the team, out of a total membership of nine, went to Frankfurt for the same reason, or more or less the same reason.

Question. What were you told in Frankfurt?

Mr. CUTLER. We were told we had no right to question the orders of the senior officer and that he had given us those instructions, we were to follow them out.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States gives a humble citizen of this country the right to petition. Here a majority of the employees of an agency say, "This thing is being run wrong. Disloyal persons are getting to the United States. We want to correct that. We want to interview these people." They are told, "Oh, no. You follow our orders or get out."

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. I was called off the floor during the debate, and I have just returned. When I came into the Chamber I heard the Senator mention Mr. Cutler's name. Will the Senator tell us who Mr. Cutler is?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Cutler's full name is John Wilson Cutler, Jr. Here is his record: In 1940 he was with the American Field Service in France and in the Middle East. Later he served with the Royal Air Force. He was in the RAF in 1941. From 1941 to 1945 he was in the United States Air Force. He was shot down over Yugoslavia, where he was made a prisoner of war during the last year of the war. My information is that he was recently promoted. I should like to give the Senator, if he will permit me, the remainder of Mr. Cutler's testimony.

Question. Who are the senior officers? Could you tell us about them?

Mr. CUTLER. There are Mr. Bashein. There are seven senior officers in Germany.

Question. Are they located in seven different places?

Mr. CUTLER. Yes. When I first went there, there were 11 senior officers in Germany. I can give you their names. Mr. Bashein, Miss Ruskin, Mr. Myerson, Mr. Hoexter, Mr. Main, Mr. Dervan, and Mr. Conan.

Question. How many of these senior officers were formerly affiliated with one of the groups which is active in expediting the work of aliens in their emigration to the United States?

Mr. CUTLER. At least three of those.

Question. Who are they?

Mr. CUTLER. Mr. Bashein, Miss Ruskin, Mr. Myerson, and Mr. Kaplan. Well, he is not a senior officer.

Question. What is Mr. Kaplan's function?

Mr. CUTLER. He is Mr. Squadrilli's executive assistant.

Question. What is Mr. Kaplan's background?

Mr. CUTLER. He was formerly employed by the American Joint Distribution Committee.

Nothwithstanding the Counter Intelligence Corps reports, which were presented to the committee, indicating several thousand cases of fraud and false documents by persons who had applications pending as displaced persons, there is a letter which Mr. Bashein of the Displaced Persons Commission wrote. I am not going to read it at this time, but I ask that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

UNITED STATES DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION,
Butzbach/Hesse, April 11, 1949.

To: All members of the staff and voluntary agencies.

From: M. D. Bashein, senior officer, Area 1.

Subject: False statements and falsification of documents by applicants.

The following is quoted from a memorandum from U. S. D. P. C. Headquarters, Frankfurt, dated April 1, 1949, for your information and you are urged to implement this directly in any case which comes to your personal attention.

"1. You will be interested to know that the Consular Service has for some time now liberalized its policy toward those persons who may have misrepresented facts prior to or in the course of making application for immigration to the United States. Consular officers have been instructed to advise each candidate as he appears for interview that should he wish to make any correction of previous statements or falsification of documents, he may do so without necessarily prejudicing his case up to the time he gives

sworn testimony which results in the issuing of the visa. This principle does not apply, of course, where the falsification involves perjury. The reasoning behind this position is well understood. Innumerable displaced persons once made misrepresentations in the sincere effort to protect themselves against retaliation from authorities representing governments from which they have taken refuge.

"2. It is unlikely, however, in the tense moments which surround the consular interview, that a candidate would alter the position which he has previously taken and which is on record. It is stressed, consequently, that every effort should be made during the early period of documentation to encourage applicants to alter any falsely presented facts in the registration forms or elsewhere and thus protect themselves against conflicting evidence that may adversely affect their later immigration status. It has been suggested in this connection that posters in appropriate languages be utilized throughout resident camps suggesting this as an advisable and authoritative course."

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the Displaced Persons Act, the burden of proof is placed upon the applicant. Section 10 provides:

The burden of proof shall be upon the person who seeks to establish his eligibility under the act.

Previously I have quoted excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Alamanza Tripp, who is in charge of the immigration detail in Europe under this phase of the matter, to show how the act and the will of Congress are being circumvented at this time.

I read further from the testimony of Mr. Tripp:

Question. Mr. Tripp, let me ask a question right there. Under the law the burden of proof is on the applicant. As a matter of practice where does the burden of proof rest insofar as the Displaced Persons Commission is concerned?

Mr. TRIPP. Well, as a matter of practice, I believe the Commission is inclined in some cases to almost require proof a person is subversive before they will reject him.

The law says the burden is on the applicant, yet Tripp says that the Displaced Persons Commission requires almost absolute proof.

Mr. John Wilson Cutler, Jr., testified, and I give excerpts from his testimony, which was given on February 6. I quote from Mr. Cutler:

This is a case I will read you about withdrawing applicants from the file. This is Mr. Donald Main, senior officer, area 6, from Mr. Alec Squadrilli.

Mr. President, that is the letter Mr. Squadrilli sent out, which was placed in the RECORD earlier today. What Mr. Cutler was testifying about was the pardon of a convicted criminal, to make him eligible to come to the United States.

Question. For what was he on parole?

Mr. CUTLER. A crime he had committed. There are many similar cases.

Question. Am I to understand that they had directed—

That is, the Displaced Persons Commission—

a favorable report to be written on a man who was then on parole?

Mr. CUTLER. Oh, yes. There are several of that. This happens to be one of them.

Mr. President, we have a case of a convicted criminal out on parole, and the selectors were asked to write a favorable report, regardless of his conviction, regardless of the fact that he was a former convict, so that his entry into the United States would be expedited.

I quote further:

If this is not forthcoming, you cannot finalize the case until the time of parole has expired. I have handled several like that personally.

Mr. Cutler gives another case, that of Joseph Kohn. He presented the file to the committee.

The above-captioned file is returned herewith for reprocessing as directed below. As far as the Commission is concerned, rejection under section 10 of the act in document and perjury cases must be based upon proof.

Mr. President, there was a man as to whom they had evidence that he was ineligible because his documents were false, or because of perjury. The burden was on his shoulders to prove that his documents were not forged, and that he had not been guilty of perjury. Yet the Commission sent the file back and said a rejection must be based upon proof, that it must be proved.

Mr. Cutler says and Mr. Main says that that is almost impossible in Germany. It is impossible in Germany because, of course, in those cases the proceedings are informal.

I read further:

Question. Would you elaborate on that? How difficult is it to obtain proof that would stand up in court?

Mr. CUTLER. It is practically impossible in Germany to obtain proof in a court of perjury. It is very, very difficult. These cases are almost all informal.

Question. If a Counter Intelligence Corps examiner comes along and says that it is alleged on information which the Counter Intelligence Corps has to the effect that a man is a Communist, is that sufficient to bar a man as far as the Displaced Persons Commission is concerned?

Mr. CUTLER. Then the question is, if the Counter Intelligence Corps can prove it. That is the question, can they prove it? Time and time again the things come up.

Not following the law, Mr. President, not placing the burden upon the applicant. The Counter Intelligence Corps says, "We have this information," yet they cannot reject a man on the information. It must be proved, and in Germany, because the courts are more or less informal, due to the chaotic condition, it cannot be proved, and through that loophole ineligibles and subversives are coming into the United States.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Then it is a fact that the way the Displaced Persons Commission is operating, the burden of proof is on the CIC to prove that a man is a perjurer or a Communist? Is that what I am to understand the situation to be?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct, and that is an impossible condition, in violation of the law.

Mr. JENNER. Does not the Senator know that the Government of the United States just got through spending—and the case is not complete yet—a million dollars to prove that Alger Hiss was a perjurer?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely true. And let me say that I seriously doubt that, due to the friends Mr. Hiss has in high places, he will ever serve a day.

Question. If the Counter Intelligence Corps examiner comes along and says that it is alleged on information, that the Counter Intelligence Corps has it to the effect that a man is a Communist, is that sufficient to bar him as far as the Displaced Persons Commission is concerned?

Mr. CUTLER. Then the subject is, if the Counter Intelligence Corps can prove it. That is the question. Can they prove it?

Time and again the same thing comes up.

The Counter Intelligence Corps says, "We have information that John Jones is a Communist." The law puts the burden on John Jones, who wants to come to the United States, to prove that he is not. The Displaced Persons Commission says "Prove it," and that cannot be done, because the trials in Germany are informal.

I ask, Mr. President, why in the name of all fairness is there objection to the committee bill, which simply improves the screening so as to protect this country by allowing only good people to come into this country? Of course, under the present act many good people have come here. The subversives, those who are ineligible, are in the minority. But I say that the Congress of the United States must do all within its power to keep out subversives, to keep out those who are ineligible. That is all the Committee on the Judiciary is attempting to do.

I quote further from Mr. Cutler:

Question. What do you mean by saying the same thing has come up?

Mr. CUTLER. Everybody must prove. If this man is a Communist you must prove it. If he is a perjurer you must prove it, and so on in many instances.

Question. The law says the burden of proof is on the applicant, does it not?

Mr. CUTLER. Yes, the law says that.

Question. But is it your testimony in effect that the Counter Intelligence Corps has to prove the man is a Communist before the man is rejected?

Mr. CUTLER. In many cases, yes.

Then he read the letter to the committee from Mr. Squadrilli.

Mr. Alamanza Tripp on this point testified further:

Question. Do then the Counter Intelligence Corps make any rejections as to the date lines and as to whether he was there December 22, 1945, or rather on or before December 22, 1945?

Mr. TRIPP. No.

Question. And as to whether he was there on January 1, 1948?

Mr. TRIPP. No.

Question. Do they ask the Counter Intelligence Corps to look into that?

Now there is the screening the Senator from New York said we had. There is the vital question: Was the man in Germany on the cut-off date? Yet the proof shows that the Counter Intelligence Corps was not even contacted nor asked for a report, nor asked for an investigation to see if the individual could qualify as a displaced person.

Mr. TRIPP. No. In fact, early in the program the CIC reports were indicating on many occasions that their investigation indicates a later entry in certain cases. The

information was usually ignored, those that I saw, anyway, and the IRO certificates were accepted.

There is the screening, Mr. President. The Displaced Persons Commission ignored the reports of the Counter Intelligence Corps, and took the certificates compiled by displaced persons themselves in IRO. Those conditions are shocking.

Question. Am I correct in understanding your statement to be then, Mr. Tripp, that in cases in which IRO had certified to the Displaced Persons Commission that XYZ, to take the specimen case, had come to the area on or before December 22, 1945, and was there on January 1, 1948, the matter was transmitted by the Displaced Persons Commission to the CIC, and then the Counter Intelligence Corps found the man really was not there on December 22, 1945, that the Displaced Persons Commission ignored that finding and accepted the initial report on the resettlement form from IRO instead of taking the Counter Intelligence Corps finding? Is that correct?

Mr. TRIPP. Not exactly.

Question. Tell me what is right.

Mr. TRIPP. The Counter Intelligence Corps does not exactly establish that he was not in one of the areas, but they found evidence which indicated that he was not.

Question. Did the CIC report that evidence back to the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes.

Question. What did the Displaced Persons Commission do with that evidence?

Mr. TRIPP. In the cases that I got, they processed them. They may have rejected some, but I did not see if they did. The ones that I saw had been processed all the way through.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Can the Senator from Mississippi think of a better way for a Russian spy to get into America than the way the Senator has just read from the evidence?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course not. They have come in that way, and they are coming in now in that way. But the question is that of screening. There is a smokescreen put up everywhere. It is said, "Why, the Displaced Persons Commission screens them. The Counter Intelligence Corps screens them. The IRO screens them. The Immigration Service screens them. The Consular Service screens them."

I digress to say, Mr. President, that the information I have been reciting is not the propaganda of paid publicists but is the testimony of American citizens who are intimately familiar with the day-by-day operations of our displaced-persons program. I shall subsequently discuss these provisions of the committee bill which the committee recommends for enactment so as to strengthen the administration of the law, but since I am presently engaged in presenting the factual material to the Senate, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to another area, and that is the IRO.

Mr. President, the present displaced-persons law defines a displaced person by incorporating by reference the definitions contained in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization. The definition which is contained in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, in addition to defining a displaced person or refugee, sets forth who shall be the concern and who shall not be the concern of the International Refugee Organization. It was clearly the congressional intent that the definition contained in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization would be a formula to be applied to administering the law by the Immigration and Naturalization Services and by the consular officers. However, under the administrative practice which has been followed in administering the law, the certifications which are made by the International Refugee Organization are accepted as binding not only upon the Displaced Persons Commission, but upon our immigration officers, and consular officers as well.

That, Mr. President, is the practice in vogue. These certifications by the International Refugee Organization are not only with reference to whether or not the applicant is a displaced person, but also with reference to other elements of the applicant's eligibility under the law, such as the date of his arrival in the occupied areas, and whether or not he was in the areas prescribed by the law.

Mr. President, as I have stated, in this whole set-up the International Refugee Organization is the most important cog in the machine. It initiates the files. Our own Government cannot go beyond the scope of those that it says are in its care and are displaced persons as defined by it. It is the main cog in this machine, and the main source of bribery and corruption, and the main source by which saboteurs and Communist agents are getting into this country. That is why it is necessary that it be deleted from this program, and that every step in connection with a displaced person getting into the United States be administered and controlled by an American agency, and supervised by citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to certain factual material which is merely typical of a great volume of information which the committee has accumulated with reference to fraudulent and false documents under the displaced persons program.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand copies of three or four reports by the Counter Intelligence Corps which are typical of numerous reports of this character by the investigative agency of the United States Army. One of them is a Counter Intelligence Corps report dated December 14, 1949, only 2½ months ago. The heading of the report is: "Possible issuance of false statements of residence, Schnaitsee, Germany."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HEADQUARTERS, REGION IV,
SIXTY-SIXTH CIC DETACHMENT,
VISA SECTION,
APO 407-A, UNITED STATES ARMY,
December 14, 1949.

Subject: Possible issuance of false statements of residence, Schnaitsee, Gemany

1. On November 19, 1949, this agent attempted to determine the validity of the enclosed list of registered residents of the community of Schnaitsee.

2. The burgomaster of Schnaitsee was interviewed and stated to this agent that he thinks that certain irregularities had occurred in his office concerning the issuance of residence slips to DP's and the recording of names in the community registration book. He claimed that this had probably been done by the secretary of the community, Mayor, Georg. The burgomaster stated that numerous people reported Mayer as having numerous visitors nightly. These visitors contacted Mayer in order to establish residence in Schnaitsee as of a past date.

3. This agent interviewed Kommissar Mueller, Bernhard, of the Land Polizei of Schnaitsee and it was determined that at the present time only one (1) person on the enclosed list was still residing in the community and who had also been in the community since May 1945, namely, Glitman, Henry, born September 20, 1922, No. 71 on enclosed list.

4. Georg Mayer, born April 21, 1879, in Mindelheim, of the office of the community Schnaitsee, was interviewed in the presence of Kommissar Mueller of the Land Polizei and stated that the majority of the names on the enclosed list are not correct as to their registration date within the community. Specifically, Mayer stated that the following persons registered in Schnaitsee on dates shown.

Leber, Najtali, born June 20, 1916, number 144, reported as having registered August 20, 1945, actually registered in June 1946.

Zynger, Szmul, born May 5, 1912, number 302, reported as having registered November 22, 1945, actually registered in September 1949. Zynger had with him two witnesses, who claimed they remembered Zynger having been in Schnaitsee in 1945. A check revealed that one of these witnesses, Lang, Josef, himself arrived in Schnaitsee on July 3, 1947, initially.

Goldstein, Marcho, born October 18, 1910, number 79, reported as having registered October 10, 1945, actually registered July 1946.

Krein, Abraham, born March 1, 1924, number 130, reported as having registered September 22, 1945, actually registered August 1946.

Mayer refused to state why he had falsely registered the people.

H. FISCHER.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the report shows that the registrar in that town, Mr. Georg Mayer, when interviewed by the Counter Intelligence Corps, in the presence of the mayor of the town, stated that his records were being doctored; that people who came there after 1945 and settled there were being certified as having come there before that date, so as to make them eligible for admission into the United States.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why was that done? Who initiated the doctoring of such papers and documents? Would the organization that passes on the applicants, to begin with, be interested in doing that?

Mr. EASTLAND. They were doing it for money.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean to say that they were accepting money to falsify documents, so as to permit those persons to enter the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. Various persons were going to Mr. Mayer at night, and he was doctoring the records of the town so as to show that those persons settled in the town earlier than they actually

had; he was doing that so as to make them eligible for admission into the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the falsification been done by interested IRO personnel? What persons or what organization have attempted to do that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Part of it is done in the IRO. Of course, the particular case to which I have just referred did not involve the IRO. But how can such matters be caught if there is no proper system of screening?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. The report shows that at the request of Bernhard Mueller, Kommissar of the Land Polizei, Mayer wrote and signed a statement in which he admitted having falsified the registry of numerous displaced persons. A signed copy of the statement is on file at the headquarters.

Mr. WHERRY. In connection with the testimony to which the Senator has just referred, let me inquire whether any applicants whose records were falsified, or for the benefit of whom other records were falsified, have been admitted into the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. Even Mr. Squadrilli admits that.

Mr. WHERRY. Have they come into the United States after the documents have been falsified?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. What organization found that out? Did the Displaced Persons Commission attempt to find out about it, or did the consular service or the immigration authorities attempt to find out about it? By what organization did the applicant have to be cleared, after his application was initiated by the IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Tripp, the head of the immigration detail in Europe, instituted that inquiry. I am sorry to have to tell the Senator that my information is that Mr. Squadrilli attempted to get him fired; I am informed that Mr. Tripp says that.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will recall that in the colloquy earlier today the Senator from Michigan asked if it were true that the immigration officials had authority to screen displaced persons as well as immigrants. Does the Senator recall that question by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that question was asked during the colloquy earlier today.

Under the present law, would the immigration authorities have authority to screen an applicant who came through with a falsified record, as the Senator has just disclosed?

Mr. EASTLAND. They do not know whether it is false, because they accept the certification by the IRO.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I make. They accept the certification by the IRO; therefore, they do not have knowledge as to the applicant or the screening which has gone on in Europe; is not that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, as I understand, that is the position the Senator from Mississippi takes, namely, that in the absence of such screening by the immigration authorities, there is no American agency or subdivision of our Government which screens the applicants after the IRO has initiated the applications and after the Displaced Persons Commission authorizes the applicants to come to the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

On that point, let me read the testimony of Mr. Tripp:

> There became available to me recently copies of the results of a fingerprint check made by the provost marshal's office in a number of cases. The first group of cases in which the information became available to me related to ninety-odd individuals. Immediately I checked the camp registration records, Camp Grohn in Bremen, to determine if any of the persons named had proceeded to the United States. I found that 33 of the people had already sailed to the United States. Examining the nature of the report in each case, I concluded without investigation that 11 of the individuals were probably deportable on criminal charges.

Yet, they are in this country now.

Mr. WHERRY. They are in this country now?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is an extremely important message. I ask unanimous consent that the debate which is proceeding be interrupted long enough for the message to be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is requested that the Senator from Mississippi may yield without losing the floor, to have the message from the President of the United States read. The Chair assumes that in that connection there may be a request for a quorum call.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

RESTORATION OF NATIONAL COAL PRODUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 492)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 2774–2775.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to carry out the recommendations of the President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3178) to restore national coal production, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to remove impediments or obstructions to trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, to protect the national health or safety, or to meet the needs of national defense or of a national emergency, the President, in time of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared, is empowered and authorized to take possession and assume control of and to operate any plant, mine, or facility engaged in or suitable for the mining, production, or distribution of coal (including any real or personal property, franchise, right, fund or other asset, or any record, pertaining to or used in connection with the operation of any or all such plants, mines, or facilities), and to take such action as he deems necessary in his discretion to carry out the authority herein conferred.

SEC. 2. Whenever an agreement concerning the terms and conditions of employment shall have been reached between the representatives of the employees and the representatives of the operators with respect to any plant, mine, or facility taken over under this Act, or whenever in the judgment of the President it is no longer necessary to continue possession, control, and operation of any such plant, mine, or facility, the President shall return possession, control, and operation of such plant, mine, or facility to the person lawfully entitled thereto.

SEC. 3. (a) In administering this act:

(1) The President is authorized to determine fair terms and conditions of employment of the employees of any mine, plant, or facility taken over under this act, but he shall not enter into any contract governing such terms and conditions with the representatives of such employees.

(2) The President is authorized to determine just compensation to be paid by the United States for the use of each mine, plant, or facility taken over under this act.

(b) The President may appoint and compensate such persons or boards as he deems necessary to assist him in making the determinations required by subsection (a).

SEC. 4. The personnel of plants, mines, or facilities taken over under this act shall be subject to the laws relating to Federal officers and employees only to the extent specified by the President. Personnel appointed for the

purpose of administering this act may be employed without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949.

SEC. 5. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall advance to the President such sums as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and for use as working capital in the operation of mines, plants, or facilities under this act. The revenues derived from the operation of any plant, mine, or facility taken over under this act may be used to defray the expenses of its operation, and to repay Reconstruction Finance Corporation advances with interest at the rate charged the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the Treasury Department.

(b) Such revenues and Reconstruction Finance Corporation advances may be expended without regard to any laws governing the expenditure of Government funds, other than laws relating to fraud, embezzlement, and other criminal acts.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, or to deny to any person whose property has been taken over by the Government under this act the right to a judicial determination of just compensation.

SEC. 8. (a) The authority conferred by this act upon the President may be exercised through any officers of the Government designated by the President.

(b) The President shall not take possession of or operate any plant, mine, or other facility under this act after June 30, 1951.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to say that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was in session this morning and will be in session tomorrow morning, beginning at 9:30, but because of the message from the President and the bill which I have just introduced, I shall ask the committee to meet in the committee room this afternoon at 4:15 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the emergency message, and the bill which has just been introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it seems to me that the calling of a meeting of the committee for today is proper. Furthermore, I hope that the committee will act with all convenient speed, believing that perhaps it may be able to report a bill tomorrow. The majority leader now advises the Senate that we shall hold a session tomorrow. We cannot afford, under the circumstances, not to act as expeditiously as may be possible, because of the seriousness of the situation as expressed in the President's message, as well as because of the psychological effect it may have upon the people of America who are watching developments with tremendous interest.

Mr. EASTLAND rose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I addressed the Chair. I did not know the Senator from Mississippi was standing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Mississippi is entitled to the floor.

Mr. TAFT. I did not understand. I was not present at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only wanted to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that last year the Senate passed a bill which contained the power of seizure, which bill has been pending in the House of Representatives since the first of last July.

That bill dealt with seizure in a somewhat different manner from that which is proposed in the President's bill. I wish to invite attention to the fact that under the bill as presented, it seems to me that the President's right to pay any wages he sees fit to pay will in effect fasten a wage scale on the operators without their consent. The power requested by the President is very much broader than that which is contained in any seizure bill we have heretofore had under consideration, and therefore, it seems to me to be practically a complete capitulation to the miners who have refused arbitration when the employers have agreed to arbitration.

I merely want to invite attention to the fact that I shall move to substitute the bill which the Senate recently passed by a substantial vote for the bill which has been suggested by the President, when that bill is reported from the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for just 2 minutes?

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the same conditions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Mississippi yielding to the Senator from Oregon, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor? The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, apparently we shall have a series of substitutes, although I desire to say, having read the President's bill, that we should keep in mind that what we seek in this emergency hour is coal for the suffering American people. I am satisfied that the President's bill will give us coal. I am satisfied that the President's bill is fair in principle, and I am further satisfied that the President's bill is not subject to the criticism which my very good and able friend from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] makes of it. I do not think it is wrong for the Government of the United States, when it is in possession of an industry in this country under Government seizure, to pay the workers what an emergency board believes to be fair wages and to grant them fair working conditions on the basis of the merits of the case as the emergency board finds them, because unless that principle is adopted, all that will be done under Government seizure is to impose upon the men working conditions, irrespective of the facts and the merits, which the employers have sought to impose upon them and which gave rise to the dispute in the first instance.

There is an area, it seems to me, of possible compromise with the Senator from Ohio, and I shall suggest it in committee this afternoon, namely, that we give consideration to a so-called retroactive principle that might be applied as a possible amendment to the President's bill.

I wish to make one further comment, and I am through.

It is true that we passed a bill at the last session of the Congress which included a seizure provision as recommended by the Senator from Ohio. Although we voted on it as a separate amendment, each one of us knew when we voted that it was a part of a larger bill, and we did not, in my judgment, vote upon it without taking into account the other provisions of the bill which would go along with it.

Mr. President, we are here met with a message which requires us to vote on a separate seizure bill without any relation whatsoever to any other proposal for an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law.

My first reaction to the President's bill is that the President has risen to heights of statesmanship in this critical hour; and I hope I shall always be nonpartisan enough to place what I feel is the welfare of the American people above any question of political expediency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further, under the same conditions?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, under the same conditions.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out one thing further which I intended to indicate. There is absolutely not the slightest assurance that if the bill recommended by the President shall be passed the men will go back to work. Far from that, the United Mine Workers, under the same leadership in 1946, struck against the Government when the Government had full possession of the mines. They did not return to work until an injunction had been sought, until a petition for contempt had been filed, and until the union had been found guilty of criminal and civil contempt, Mr. Lewis had been fined $10,000, and the union had been fined $3,500,000. The next day they went back to work.

So, Mr. President, so far as seizure is concerned, there is not the slightest guarantee that seizure will solve the current problem. I think we should certainly remember that there should be the power of injunction in any bill that is passed, as well as the power of seizure, because otherwise the precedent set shows that the Government is completely at the mercy of the miners who refuse to work.

Mr. JENNER and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Indiana, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, it seems to me that in the present great emergency, in which the people of the country

are suffering from a lack of coal, an emergency which has been brought about because the laws which are on the statute books were not followed or enforced as they should have been—a fact which every thinking American knows—it is a kind of delaying tactics to come to the Congress today asking for the introduction and reference to a committee of a bill, which subsequently will reach the floor, at which time the various ideas which we can see this body is going to have will be debated.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon sounds very much like a candidate, for we discussed a seizure bill in this body last year for 3 weeks, and I believe the record will show that the junior Senator from Oregon was opposed to it. That seizure bill anticipated the very situation which confronts the Nation tonight, and that seizure bill also provided for injunction.

Therefore it seems to me that we should act in order to help the people of the country who are cold—not cold tomorrow, not the day after tomorrow, or not next week, but who are cold now. In my State the school systems are closed. In view of that condition it seems to me that in this hour of emergency, rather than have new legislation, with all these prima donna statemen having their two-bits to say about it, we might as well take a bill which passed this body a year ago, and which is pending in the House of Representatives, a bill on which the administration has kept its foot. Let it take its foot off; let the House pass that bill, which they can do in 1 hour, and then the President can sign it, and it can become a law.

I am tired of people playing politics with crises and emergencies. This very legislation passed this body a year ago, so why pass it again?

Let us take up the idea of seizure and injunction, which we would all like to see, and debate it next June or July or August. But the people are cold now.

One body of the Congress acted almost a year ago. Let the President take his foot off the bill passed last year, let it go to conference, let the differences be ironed out, and it can be a law in an hour's time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for half a minute?

Mr. EASTLAND. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and to commend him on his very cogent and statesmanlike attitude. He presented a measure last year which to my mind would have met the situation.

I also wish to bring to the attention of the Senate, in view of the President's message, the second portion of the message, which I realize is not so vital as the first part. He calls the attention of the Congress to the necessity of establishing a commission of inquiry, composed of Members of Congress, members of the executive branch, and of the public, to make a thorough study of the coal industry.

As of March 1, the junior Senator from Minnesota, the junior Senator from Oregon, and the junior Senator from Illinois, introduced a bill for the establishment of a bipartisan national coal commission. I understand the bill has been referred to the Committee of Territories and Insular Affairs, and in view of the statement of the President, and the facts of the present situation, I hope the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs will hold hearings on such a bill, report it and have it acted upon, so that we may proceed as expeditiously as possible to get at the root of the difficulty which now faces the country.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may yield to the Senator from Oregon, who wishes to make merely a remark or two.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from Indiana, in complete good nature, that I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself as to who has made a partisan political speech on this subject this afternoon.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana under the same conditions.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon is going to be a big peacemaker. He is going to work out, possibly, an amendment to the bill which will satisfy and help everybody. The bill the junior Senator from Oregon has introduced, and which he proposes as a compromise, was voted on by this body last year. It was defeated by a vote of 77 to 9.

Mr. President, I am not playing politics; I am trying to get coal. My point is that this body has passed a bill which provided for seizure and injunction. It is pending in the other House of the Congress. It could be brought out of committee and passed, the differences could be ironed out in conference, it could be signed, and it could be the law of the land before the sum comes up tomorrow. Why introduce a bill and send it to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and let the great statesmen of this great deliberative body have their say, when the Senate has already spoken on the bill of the Senator from Oregon and said "No" by a vote of 77 to 9? That is my point. Let us have action. We are in an emergency. Let gentlemen quit playing politics.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois, under the same conditions?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to read a sentence or two from the message from the President of the United States which has just been read at the desk. I read from the second paragraph:

> Since February 6, 1950, the production of bituminous coal has been dangerously curtailed. By now stocks of coal are almost exhausted, and many parts of our country face crisis conditions.
>
> * * * * * * * Within a very few days we shall be virtually out of soft coal. The danger to the national health and safety is real and immediate. It requires action at once.

I read further a portion of the message, where the President said:

> I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the Government to take over the coal mines and operate them temporarily as a public service.
>
> The parties are continuing their negotiations, and I earnestly hope that they will reach agreement before it actually becomes necessary for the Government to take possession of the mines. But we can wait no longer to prepare ourselves with the necessary legislative authority.
>
> I am submitting at this time a draft of legislation to accomplish this purpose. I earnestly request that the Congress consider this proposal and enact the needed legislation as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I merely wish to make one or two comments with respect to what my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle have said.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was one of the authors of the Taft-Hartley law, which is now on the statute books, will not press the amendment he proposes to offer before the committee. My reason for that statement is one of the reasons that has been advanced by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. The present emergency is real and it is serious. There can be no question about that. We have to assume that the facts as stated in the message of the President are true and correct. If the emergency is a real one, it seems to me there is no point becoming involved in a long and continued controversy in the Senate and the House of Representatives over another so-called Taft-Hartley bill.

Knowing the good judgment the Senator from Ohio has about all matters, I am sure that after he duly considers the message, he will not proceed to precipitate a long debate, thereby perhaps keeping coal from coming out of the ground.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio that the very fact that we pass a seizure bill will not put shovels into the hands of the coal miners. They do not have to go back to work unless they want to. But I am convinced that when the Government seizes the mines, the men in the mines, because of their patriotism and loyalty to their country, will not continue to strike against their Government.

I may be wrong about that. Time alone will tell. But I believe that to be beyond any question of doubt. Certainly this is probably the last legal resort Congress will have to consider, and I am satisfied that we should act upon the proposed bill as an emergency measure, and not attempt to substitute this kind of provision or that kind of

bill for the one the President has said he seeks.

I do not object, of course, to some amendments which may be in the best interests of the country and the public as a whole. But for us to become involved in a long-continued controversy and battle over what a proper labor law should be, in the midst of a national emergency, seems to me to be the height of folly. I sincerely hope that those on this side of the aisle who have heretofore been strongly in favor of the Taft-Hartley law will give every consideration to the President's message in the light of the existing national emergency, which affects the public health and safety.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, Mr. President, under the same conditions as previously.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to make any observations respecting the proposed labor legislation. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, in view of the announcement he made, whether the Senate will convene tomorrow at noon regardless of what action the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare might make with respect to reporting legislation to the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. So that whether the report is made or not, the Senate will convene, and if the labor legislation is not brought forth, the pending business, of course, will be the displaced persons bill?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. There is another good reason for the Senate being in session tomorrow. The Senator from Nebraska knows that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is very anxious to leave for Nevada on Monday night. It had not originally been intended that a session of the Senate be held tomorrow, but in view of the President's emergency message, I think it is proper that we should hold a session tomorrow. It may be that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can agree upon reporting a bill.

I sincerely hope they can report a bill.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that several Senators have understood that there would not be a vote upon the displaced-persons legislation tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I can assure the Senator that there will be no vote on the displaced-persons legislation tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to hold up action on the bill, but as the majority leader knows, some Senators will not be here tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope we can vote not later than Monday night on the displaced-persons bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield on the same condition that I have yielded previously.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader is correct in his belief that the miners will go back if the Congress passes the seizure bill the President has sent to us. But I wish to call to his attention as the able Senator from Ohio did, that in 1946 the same miners did strike against the Government, and that it was necessary to go into Federal Court and file charges of contempt against the miners, and they were fined $3,500,000.

I hope that in this instance the miners will go back to work, but I do not think we have any assurance that they will. I think we are up against the same condition we were in 1946.

One other thing, Mr. President. I hope that if we pass the legislation he has asked us to pass, the President of the United States will not call it a "slave-labor act;" that he will not educate the 400,000 miners to violate the law as he has been doing for the past 2 years since the Taft-Hartley law was enacted.

In my opinion, the President of the United States has taught the miners that the Taft-Hartley Act, the act under which they were working, was a "slave" act.

Mr. President, I ask this question: Is it any wonder that the miners violated the court injunction? Is it any wonder that they refused to go back to work, when the head of the Nation, over a period of months and months, has called the attention, not only of the miners, but of all other wage earners in the United States, and the people, that the only legislation under which he could deal with such crises and such situations was, in his own words, a "slave-labor act"; that it was no good, and should be repealed? He educated the workers to disobey the law, which they did when the time came that he himself was called upon to invoke it.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. No, Mr. President, I do not yield at this time. I yielded to the Senator from Indiana for the purpose, as I thought, of placing something in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me to make a unanimous consent request, if by so doing he does not lose the floor?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield under those conditions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to report its findings upon the bill introduced this afternoon by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] during the recess of the Senate, if it is necessary that it be done, and I further ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the first request the Senator made, because I think that will expedite procedure. But I ask the majority leader to withhold the second portion of his unanimous consent request for immediate consideration of the bill until the bill comes before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I serve notice on the Senate now that when the bill is reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I shall then ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, and if I cannot secure unanimous consent, I shall move that the bill be taken up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized to report on the proposed coal legislation during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for another inquiry of the majority leader?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield on the same basis as before.

Mr. WHERRY. What I have in mind is to expedite the program, so I presume it has some priority. I should like to know what is the intention of the majority leader respecting the length of the session tonight and tomorrow night? Does the Senator expect the Senate to sit later than usual?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senate will remain in session until around 6 o'clock.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

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

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] may address the Senate at this time without prejudice to my rights to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me a few minutes for the purpose of explaining an amendment which I have submitted and which is printed and lies on the table, to H. R. 4567, the bill which is now pending before the Senate.

The amendment I have submitted is in the interest of both the displaced person and the sponsor, or the employer of a displaced person. The amendment has no bearing or effect of any nature on who shall be admitted, or how, or when displaced persons shall be admitted to this country, but deals in its entirety with the handling of a displaced person after he has been received into this country and has been accepted and taken in charge by the sponsor.

Mr. President, I think we are all familiar with the fact that in some sections of the United States considerable difficulty is experienced with some displaced persons after they have been received into the United States and are in the employ of their sponsors. We are all familiar, I believe, with the fact that in some cases the sponsor has not lived up to his responsibility with reference to the displaced person. My amendment is intended to equalize the situation and to see to it that both the displaced person

and the sponsor receive fair treatment after the displaced person is placed.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 20, which referred to many instances of displaced persons who, after having been received into the country, made no sincere efforts to stay with the sponsors with whom they had been placed.

In other words, after a displaced person had gotten into this country, sometimes almost immediately, and sometimes within a few days, he left the sponsor and sought other employment. Under such conditions it is apparent that the displaced person has come into this country with the avowed intention of not living up to his agreement to work at the assigned work for the performance of which he was admitted. My amendment provides that under such conditions the displaced person shall be turned over to the immigration authorities, who shall handle the case and take the displaced person back to the country from which he came.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. President, the difficulty, to my way of thinking, does not always lie with the displaced person. There are sponsors who had in mind to bring displaced persons to the United States and to make literally slaves or serfs of them, and who have made conditions intolerable for displaced persons so that they actually have had to leave the employment of their sponsors. My amendment provides for the resettlement of such displaced persons.

Mr. President, my amendment makes a workable plan out of this humanitarian idea, this humanitarian program of bringing displaced persons to the United States. I know of my own knowledge cases of displaced persons who have found their working conditions to be intolerable, which has necessitated their leaving their employers. They have more or less been turned out upon the highway, without friends, without resources, in a strange country, unable to speak the English language, and we find them in great difficulty. My amendment takes care of such cases.

I am aware of the fact that the amendment will call for some additional expense, but it should not be great, for the only requirement in connection with the handling of displaced persons under the conditions I have set forth would be the addition of a few examiners. I cannot see the need for any large number of additional personnel. Of course, I know that some bureaus or departments or other agencies of Government attempt to increase their work, to make themselves a considerable amount of unnecessary work and to employ a considerable number of unnecessary personnel. But, under the amendment, if the Commission handles the situation in the way it should be handled, the additional expense will be very small.

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the chairman of the committee and the Senate will accept my amendment. I repeat that the amendment should have been in the original act. If it is made a part of the present law it will make for a far more acceptable, a much fairer, and a far more workable displaced persons law.

Again I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the time he has yielded to me.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has a very meritorious amendment. I shall certainly vote for it. I should like to say a few words in support of it, to show that the amendment would improve the operation of the displaced persons program, so far as the United States is concerned.

The present displaced persons law requires, as a prerequisite to eligibility, that the displaced persons shall have assurance of a job and of housing in the United States, without displacing from a job or from housing a person already in the United States. Mr. President, between 80 and 90 percent of the assurances are blanket assurances submitted by voluntary agencies. The Displaced Persons Commission has even validated assurances of employment and housing which have been made by other displaced persons. Just think of that, Mr. President. The Displaced Persons Commission has accepted assurances to that effect by former displaced persons, who made such assurances in behalf of other displaced persons who were seeking admission into the United States. Such assurances were given by displaced persons who only recently were admitted to the United States. The Displaced Persons Commission accepts such assurances without any independent investigation to ascertain whether, in fact, houses and jobs are available for the displaced persons covered by the assurances.

The Displaced Persons Commission has issued a regulation reading in part, as follows:

> Assurances of suitable employment and safe and sanitary housing provided by a public agency or a voluntary agency recognized by the Commission for this purpose need not be assurances of a specifically identified job or housing accommodations.

Mr. Ugo Carusi testified before the Immigration Subcommittee, with reference to assurances, in part, as follows:

> Question. What investigation is made by the Commission or by any agency of the Government of the United States with reference to a particular applicant, to ascertain whether or not there is a specified job or a specified house available without displacing some other person from that job or from his home?

Mr. Carusi's answer was "None."

Yet, Mr. President, that was their primary duty, under the law. That is merely another instance of the congressional intent being ignored, as a result of such loose operation. Is it any wonder that although the law provides for the admission of 205,000 displaced persons, yet as of December 31, 1949, the Displaced Persons Commission already had issued valid assurances for an estimated 345,000 persons?

Mr. President, let me say in passing that although the present law and the Senate committee bill contain a job and housing assurance provision with respect to all displaced persons, the substitute bill sponsored by the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators does not contain such a provision with reference to the 18,000 Poles, the 10,000 Greeks, and the 4,000 former residents of Shanghai who are covered by the substitute bill. This is one of the areas in which the substitute bill would remove the safeguards of the present law which were designed to protect the best interests of the United States. It was the judgment of the Judiciary Committee, however, that in view of the housing shortage and rising unemployment, coupled with the progressive increase of admissions under our general immigration laws, these safeguards must be maintained.

Mr. President, before the message from the President of the United States was received, I had placed in the RECORD exhibit A, being a report from the Counter Intelligence Corps of the United States Army.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of the Counter Intelligence Corps dated December 21, 1949, entitled "Fraudulent Residence Certificates in Schnaitsee, Germany."

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

HEADQUARTERS, REGION IV,
SIXTY-SIXTH CIC DETACHMENT,
VISA SECTION,
APO 407-A, UNITED STATES ARMY,
December 21, 1949.

To: Commanding Officer, Sixty-sixth CIC Detachment, USAREUR, APO 154, United States Army.

Attention: Major Abraham.

Subject: Fraudulent residence certificates from Schnaitsee, Germany.

1. Enclosed is photostatic copy of foreign-residents register of Gemeinde Schnaitsee with cover letter signed by Mayer, secretary of the Gemeinde and addressed to Miss Gertrude Ruskin, United States DP Commission (exhibit I). This list which alleges residence of DP's in Schnaitsee has been established as fraudulent. The following facts have been uncovered:

(a) Many of the alleged residents show the date of registration to be on a Sunday or a German legal holiday. The registration office for Schnaitsee revealed that the office is closed on Sundays and German legal holidays. Thus a person arriving in Schnaitsee on Sunday, November 25, 1945, would be registered on Monday, November 26, 1945. Person would not be permitted to back-date his registration. An inspection of list (exhibit I) reveals 28 persons showing date of registration on a Sunday or German legal holiday. These names are encircled in ink.

2. Bernhard Mueller, kommissar of landpolizei, Schnaitsee, and Georg Mayer, secretary of Gemeinde Schnaitsee, were interviewed at which time Mayer admitted irregularities in maintenance of his registration records (exhibit II).

3. At the request of Bernhard Mueller, kommissar of landpolizei, Schnaitsee, Mayer wrote and signed a statement admitting having falsely registered numerous DP's (exhibit III). A signed copy of this statement is on file at this headquarters.

4. A list of foreign residents of Schnaitsee during various months, which was submitted to the landrat treasury, is enclosed as exhibit IV. These rosters were submitted in order to draw monetary allowances from the treasury. During the period November 1945 to March 1946 the highest number of foreign

residents reported was eight. Alleged list of residents (exhibit I) has more than 200 foreign residents in Schnaitsee during the period of November 1945 to March 1946.

5. Individual cards showing monetary compensation to foreign residents are enclosed (exhibit V).

6. Photostatic copy of the actual Schnaitsee register is inclosed as exhibit VIII. The register reveals numerous irregularities.

(a) Registrations do not follow in order by date. Person number 30d is registered on January 10, 1946. Person number 32 is registered on August 1, 1945.

(b) Numerous changes, erasures and additions are evident.

7. Exhibit VII is a photostatic copy of a card file retained in the office of Georg Mayer and allegedly established date of residence of Zynger, Szmul Leib in Schnaitsee as of November 22, 1945. Zynger came to Schnaitsee in September 1949 and stated to Mayer that he, Zynger, had been in Schnaitsee in November 1945 and requested that his name be entered on the registry to reflect this date. Zynger produced a notarized statement and two witnesses who attested that they had seen Zynger in Schnaitsee in November 1945. A check of the Schnaitsee registry revealed that one of these witnesses, Josef Land, himself arrived in Schnaitsee initially on July 3, 1947.

8. Bernhard Mueller, kommissar of landpolizei, Schnaitsee, was interviewed on December 9, 1949, at which time he stated that he has initiated legal proceedings against Georg Mayer for falsification of official records.

9. As a result of this investigation, a list of all DP's concerned has been compiled. This list showing which DP's were actually present in Schnaitsee during 1945 is inclosed as exhibit VI.

B. J. ROLAK,
Captain, CMP, Chief, Visa Section
(For the Commanding Officer).

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, exhibit C, being a Counter Intelligence Corps report dated December 8, 1949, relative to false identity documents at Kaufbeuren, Germany.

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

HEADQUARTERS, REGION IV,
SIXTY-SIXTH CIC DETACHMENT,
VISA SECTION, APO 407-A,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
December 27, 1949.

Subject: False Identity Documents, Kaufbeuren, Germany.

To: Mr. D. W. Main, Senior Officer, DP Commission, APO 407, United States Army.

1. Attached is report of this Section in regard to issuance of false documents in Kaufbeuren, Germany.

B. J. ROLAK,
Captain, CMP, Chief, Visa Section
(For the Commanding Officer).

FALSE IDENTITY DOCUMENTS, KAUFBEUREN, GERMANY

1. On December 8, 1949, an agent of this Section interviewed Mr. Schindele, custodian and recorder of the Einwohnermeldeamt of Stadt Kaufbeuren and Kreis Kaufbeuren, located in the Rathaus, Kaufbeuren, Germany. Mr. Schindele stated in substance that this Einwohnermeldeamt was formerly in the custody of one Joseph Glueck and that on April 1, 1949, the land police in Kaufbeuren found that Glueck, in conspiracy with a Polish DP named Wilhelm Grau, was issuing false residence certificates and Kennkarte certification to DP's upon their application. Mr. Schindele stated that he has had reason to check his records against various lists of DP's claiming residence in Kaufbeuren and has found a large number to be false registrations. Mr. Schindele stated that any Kennkarte or residence certificate signed by Glueck prior to April 1, 1949, are to be considered as probably false if made out in the name of DP's. Glueck is presently under investigation and criminal charges are being placed against him by the German authorities of Kaufbeuren.

2. Mr. Schindele stated that his records reveal that Glueck's accomplice, Wilhelm Grau was born August 2, 1919, in Stanislaw, Poland, and that he came from Stanislaw, Poland to Kaufbeuren and registered January 21, 1946. Information on Grau's registration card reveals that he has left Kaufbeuren for immigration to the United States.

3. Mr. Schindele stated that he was present in Kaufbeuren at the time the Concentration Camp of Steinholz in Kaufbeuren was liberated. From his personal knowledge he states that all inmates of Polish nationality left by train for Poland immediately after liberation, and that to the best of his knowledge, none of them stayed in Kaufbeuren nor returned at a later date. Mr. Schindele has the Anmeldungen on all inmates of the Steinholz Concentration Camp in his possession at the present time. These records, examined by an agent of this Section, show the name of all inmates, their date of birth, date of internment, date of arrival in Steinholz, where they came from prior to transfer to Steinholz, and the date of their death or release. These records are available for further reference.

4. Mr. Schindele stated that Glueck issued residence certificates to DP's without first consulting any of the records available in his office. After a cursory examination Schindele gave the following names as having false Kennkarten issued by Glueck prior to April 1, 1949:

Hoger, Joseph, born December 20, 1901, at Kieling, Poland.

Hoger, Sara, born March 15, 1893, at Kieling, Poland.

Lieber, Schalom, born March 6, 1920, at Rzeszow, Poland.

Lieber, Miriam, born August 4, 1928, at Czernowicz, Poland.

Thaler, Majer, born June 4, 1910, at Stanislaw, Poland.

Thaler, Ada, born June 23, 1922, at Kieszeniow, Poland.

Sojcher, Aba, born May 20, 1918, at Kolomea, Poland.

Schulmann, Gitl, born June 24, 1906, at Pinsk, Poland.

Brodski, Joseph, born July 22, 1913, at Tararlije, Rumania.

Brodski, Chochak, born November 15, 1915, at Tararlije, Rumania.

Brodski, Dawid, born July 2, 1886, at Tararlije, Rumania.

Brodski, Rywa, born February 21, 1895, at Tararlije, Rumania.

Mr. Schindele stated that he would further search his record for more false documents and that he would have the names for further reference.

B. J. ROLAK,
Captain, CMP, Chief, Visa Section.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, those reports show specific cases, with names, of the use of fraudulent documents in the case of persons who were permitted to enter the United States.

Here, again, Mr. President, let me say that these reports are not fiction; they are not propaganda. They are routine reports of the Counter-Intelligence Corps of the United States Army. These reports bear out exactly the testimony of officials of the United States Government in regard to fraud, bribery, and corruption.

Some few weeks ago there appeared in executive session before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary a witness who, as I have previously shown, was formerly director of certain phases of Army intelligence work in Germany, and who has intimate knowledge of security problems in connection with the displaced persons program. He testified, in part, as follows:

Question. Now, would you express yourself on the false and fraudulent document situation?

The WITNESS. We had numerous instances of people who passed through our screening centers being found with false and fraudulent documents or no documentation at all. I had linguists, young men, officers, and enlisted men, attached to me, of incredible ability, and we broke one large ring in Berlin of agents attempting to pass through because this young man could tell when somebody spoke Polish with a Russian accent.

Mr. President, I submit that the word of that former high official of the United States Army Counter Intelligence Corps is entitled to at least the fleeting consideration of the Congress.

I read further from his testimony:

He found at that time a number of members of the Soviet Intelligence Service trying to be filtered through as bona fide political persecutees.

Think of that, Mr. President. Members of the Soviet Intelligence Service whom the Russians were attempting to filter through as political persecutees.

I read further from his testimony:

They included both men and women. The entire ring, I believe, was broken up and it caused quite an international incident because in the process of breaking it up we arrested several Russian officers in the act of engaging in espionage in the American forces and that finally got into the newspapers, and you recall that the Soviets in return arrested two of our officers and held them for 6 weeks.

Now, Mr. President, let me invite the attention of the Senate to the unassailable facts respecting the loose security check system which is presently in operation in the administration of our displaced persons program. Contrary to what the Senator from New York has said, there is not adequate screening.

Mr. Almanza Tripp, whom I have previously identified, testified as follows:

Mr. TRIPP. There became available to me recently copies of the results of a fingerprint check made by the provost marshal's office in a number of cases. The first group of cases in which the information became available to me related to ninety-odd individuals. Immediately I checked the camp registration records, Camp Grohn in Bremen, to determine if any of the persons named had proceeded to the United States. I found that 33 of the people had already sailed to the United States. Examining the nature of the report in each case, I concluded without investigation that 11 of the individuals were probably deportable on criminal charges.

Question. Has it not been the policy of the Displaced Persons Commission to avoid BDC checks or provost marshal checks in the processing of displaced persons on the basis of this calculated risk theory of the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. TRIPP. I do not know whether I would say they did it to avoid, but what they have

done is process practically all cases without receiving the returns from the Berlin Document Center or from the provost marshal.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JENNER. Has there not been evidence before the committee that those in charge of operating the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe are not concerned primarily with the security of the country, but that their entire objective is to meet quotas, to rush them through, to get displaced persons into America and, so they say, "Let's get the job done, let's get the 205,000 displaced persons here; we don't care whether they are subversives or Communists, or criminals or thugs, or black marketeers?" Has not that been the whole premise of the operation of the Displaced Persons Commission in Europe?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the result. It is the result of what has happened, because the man in charge of the immigration detail in Europe, an American official, says the displaced persons have been processed without receiving the returns from the Berlin document center or from the provost marshal—the two places in Germany where the information is assembled.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. I continue reading the testimony of Mr. Tripp:

Question. Those are centers where there would be criminal records on individuals?

Mr. TRIPP. The Berlin Document Center records would indicate Nazi affiliations and the provost marshal records would indicate arrest and convictions, possibly by the American authorities, in criminal cases and in some cases convictions in German courts.

Question: It was because of your check into the BDC records and the provost marshal records that you found these one hundred-odd cases of criminal conviction, 33 of which had already come to the United States; is that right?

Mr. TRIPP. That is right.

Question. What expression was made to you by the Displaced Persons Commission with reference to why the Displaced Persons Commission would not make BDC checks or provost marshal checks to ascertain whether or not the displaced persons had criminal records?

Mr. TRIPP. I was told earlier in the program that if a case was held until the BDC checked——

Question. What is BDC?

Mr. TRIPP. Berlin Document Center—and provost marshal checked, it would materially slow down the program.

Question. Who made that statement?

Mr. TRIPP. I believe the first person I spoke to about it was Mr. Kaplan. That was one of the first things I discussed on arrival in Germany.

Mr. Kaplan is Mr. Squadrilli's executive assistant. Continuing:

Question. He is Mr. Squadrilli's right-hand man?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes; I believe he is the executive assistant.

Question. You had nevertheless on your own volition been making in some instances BDC checks and provost marshal checks?

Mr. TRIPP. We had been making BDC checks, but I had not been making provost marshal checks, but recently, as I say, two groups of reports became available to me, and I have now filed a written request with the provost marshal's office that I be supplied with the result of every fingerprint check.

Question. The Displaced Persons Commission decided, as you understand it, that they would take the calculated risk of not waiting until they received this answer from the Berlin Document Center?

Mr. TRIPP. Yes; and also from the provost marshal.

Question. Does CIC send a letter to the provost marshal asking for information?

Mr. TRIPP. That is in regard to fingerprinting.

Question. Does the Displaced Persons Commission cause the Counter Intelligence Corps to give the Commission a report before the final fingerprint records come back from the provost marshal?

Mr. TRIPP. I have not been able to find out just what those procedures are on the fingerprints.

Question. Well, at any rate, as I understand it, leaving out the fingerprints for a moment, your information is that, although the Displaced Persons Commission requests the CIC to make this report as to the applicant's character and history and all that, the CIC sends over a communication to the Berlin Document Center asking what their records show, yet the Displaced Persons Commission has told the CIC to get word back to the Commission about this application without waiting for a response from the Berlin Document Center; is that right?

Mr. TRIPP. That is right.

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

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In connection with applicants who have been admitted as displaced persons under the definition now used, has the Displaced Persons Commission vetoed or overruled any of the applications which have been affirmatively approved by the IRO, referring especially to cases in which the records were falsified?

Mr. EASTLAND. In some instances it has.

Mr. WHERRY. Have there been many instances of it, percentagewise?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know the answer to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Did they do it voluntarily, or was the matter brought to their attention by the consular agent or the immigration authorities?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know. My judgment is that they act voluntarily.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not correct that, although the law does not provide that tests of eligibility made by the employees of the IRO must be accepted by the Displaced Persons Commission, they are nevertheless actually accepted?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. They are actually accepted. Then, there is no authority, is there, on the part of the consular agent or the immigration authorities to veto the procedure now being followed by the IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. Except under the general immigration law.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. But not under the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the question asked this morning by the Senator from Michigan. It seems to me, so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned, it is the big issue in connection with the pending subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. WHERRY. The question of quotas is another matter. I should like to ask the Senator further, is ours the only country which allows foreigners to sit on a board, such as the board of the IRO, to pass on the applications of persons seeking admission to this country?

Mr. EASTLAND. Ours is the only country which permits a foreign international organization to have anything to do with the admittance of displaced persons for the purpose of becoming citizens.

Mr. WHERRY. The burden of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, if I understand correctly, is to the effect that what the committee proposes through the amendments offered by it is to prescribe a definition. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is to prescribe a definition as broad as the IRO definition—but it is to be our definition.

Mr. WHERRY. What does it define?

Mr. EASTLAND. It defines a displaced person.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, the administration of the law shall be adjusted to provide for a board or agency of the United States Government which is to approve or veto finally the applications of displaced persons to enter the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Furthermore, it is to initiate the application; that is, the United States representatives will select those who are to be permitted to enter the country.

Mr. WHERRY. Who is opposing it?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not understand why it should be opposed; but it is not so provided in the substitute which is to be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the substitute provide which is in contradiction of that?

Mr. EASTLAND. In that respect it carries forward the present law.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, the present definition of a displaced person, under IRO?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the substitute bill in any way modify it?

Mr. EASTLAND. It carries forward the system that is in vogue now.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the substitute provide that a Government agency, such as the Immigration Service, may veto the application of a displaced person desiring to enter the United States who has been certified by the IRO and the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think a fair interpretation of existing law is that it could be done, but it is not the present practice.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, without a new definition, such as the committee proposes, even though technically the result which I mentioned might be brought about, yet there is not the will to do it. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is entirely correct. The administrative policy in the

field of qualifying a person as a displaced person has been that the decision of the Displaced Persons Commission shall be final.

Mr. WHERRY. If it is provided under existing law, and if the substitute also contains the provision, why should there be objection to the committee bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. The substitute does not so provide; the committee bill does.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the committee bill contains the provision; but, even technically, if the present law provides what we are here attempting to do, what objection is there to the committee bill as amended, the purpose of which is to accomplish a proper administration of the act?

Mr. EASTLAND. There should be no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. EASTLAND. There should be none.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator another question. I am not sure the Senator knows, because I am not certain the testimony is here. Early in the debate, the distinguished Senator said certain records were falsified, according to the testimony of a man named Main, if I am not mistaken. There was a case in which a man went into a town, contacted the official, whoever he is, who makes the record, and persuaded him to falsify the record so that applicant would become eligible under IRO.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was not one case. There is testimony as to 3,500 such cases in one area.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked why it was, and the answer from the distinguished Senator was that they received money for it. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether these applicants have any money?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is plenty of money in black-market operations. Many of them have money.

Mr. WHERRY. Many of the applicants have money?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not true that the committee had evidence that there was in the black market plenty of 50- and 100-dollar bills, "green money," as it is called, which is American money, which displaced persons have been handling?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The matter is becoming more involved.

Mr. JENNER. It was New York money.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not suppose the Senator has evidence as to where that money came from.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would judge that it came from New York, but I do not know.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. It is Series B money, from the New York district. I do not know how it got to Europe.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will yield here, without prejudicing my right to the floor, to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who heard the testimony on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Indiana has already answered the question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to see if he can answer it to the satisfaction of the majority leader.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I intend to go into the subject in detail when I speak on the bill, but, in order to make it clear to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, there is an organized black market. The heads of it are displaced persons. They not only have plenty of money, but it is American money, series B, from the New York district, 50- and 100-dollar bills. We had evidence that they are using American ambulances, driven by displaced persons, which are filled with cigarettes and things of that kind. Some of the displaced persons have plenty of money.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is a report from a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission to the Commission itself referring to corruption in the IRO, which initiates all the applications.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the very point I was trying to get from the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. What I am trying to do is to justify the definition we are attempting to establish in section 3 of the bill. With the evidence which has been submitted, which has not been available to Members of the Senate, and knowing the distinguished Senator from Mississippi as I do—I am satisfied that he is a man of not only high integrity, but of honor—it causes one who is trying to make up his mind in voting on a definition, to think very seriously. I cannot, for the life of me, see why there should be any objection to some Government agency, whether it be the consular service or some other agency, having the last word in vetoing the application of a displaced person if there is any reason to believe that the applicant should not be admitted. I cannot see why there should be any objection to that.

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot, either. I thank the distinguished Senator for his personal reference and compliment. It is not a question of veracity on my part. I have simply read the testimony of officers of the Government. The Senate can make up its own mind whether the testimoney is correct. Frankly, I think it is.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the definition which is proposed by the committee in any way discriminate against any displaced person?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no semblance of discrimination in the committee bill against any racial or religious group as to the definition of a displaced person. There is tremendous discrimination in the substitute bill. In fact, the substitute bill is a slander against every individual in the United States through whose veins flows Germanic blood.

Mr. WHERRY. One more question, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no discrimination as to the numbers involved, is there?

Mr. EASTLAND. In that respect the committee bill and the substitute are about the same.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the big issue is the definition that is proposed to be established by the committee, through its amendment, as opposed to the present law and what is contained in the substitute. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Whether we shall take in persons who have suffered and who are of German ethnic origin.

Mr. WHERRY. And that runs to the date and to the ethnic origin of the applicant. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Some of the finest citizens in this country are people of Germanic origin. I think many displaced persons in that category would be an asset to the United States. I hope that under any bill we shall take a fair proportion of those persons and not discriminate against them as is attempted to be done in the substitute proposed by the Senator from West Virginia.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So long as the question I asked has brought out the answer from the distinguished Senator from Mississippi relative to the persons excluded because of German ethnic origin, I should like to say that in my own State there is a considerable population of the very type of persons the Senator has mentioned. They do not need to have anyone carry a brief for them. They have established themselves as very fine citizens; they are exceptional; they make excellent citizens and are helping to build up not only our citizenship, but our American institutions. It seems to me there should be no discrimination against them.

Mr. EASTLAND. The white population of my State is of as pure Anglo-Saxon blood as can be found in the United States, and I am proud of it. I know the German people are fine people; I know that people of Germanic origin are among the best people of the country. One of the great aims is to remove the stigma of discrimination against them. That is why the Senate committee has provided for the admission of persons of German ethnic origin. The IRO discriminates against them and says, "They are not our concern. Let us kick them out, even though they suffered, even though they supported the Allies. They can starve to death. We care nothing about them. We shall not help them. They are not eligible to come to the United States."

We ratified that in the law in 1948, but to rectify a great wrong, the Senate committee desires to admit persons of

German ethnic origin, if they are otherwise eligible. Such a provision is not in the substitute bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator has a question about it——

Mr. KILGORE. I was not going to ask a question on this point.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not true that unless some provision is made to take care of persons of German ethnic origin who have been run away from their homes because of the Potsdam agreement, unless we make it possible for them to come in, there is no reason at all for increasing the number of displaced persons to 339,000? Is it not a fact that if the present law, which provides for 205,000, were permitted to run out, there would be only a very few war-displaced persons left in Europe?

Mr. EASTLAND. It would be only the "hard core" of criminals and misfits who could not qualify.

Mr. JENNER. So, if we are going to increase the number, as is proposed in both the committee bill and the substitute, we must permit persons of German ethnic origin to come in, or we shall not have any displaced persons at all. Is not that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. One of the greatest crimes in all history was the uprooting from their homes, where their people had lived for centuries, of men, women, and children, whose only offense was that through their veins flowed Germanic blood and that a thousand years ago their ancestors had been of German stock. They were turned out into the cold and snow, driven like cattle across eastern and central Europe into Germany, where many of them died on the march like flies. I say that is one of the greatest crimes in all human history, a crime to which the United States was a party. In this bill we have attempted, in a meager way, to permit some of those persons to come into the United States. They are the real sufferers. That is the real immigration problem in Europe today. I say "immigration" because, in the last analysis, this is an immigration bill. This is not a displaced persons bill. The real displaced persons have been taken care of.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Nevada have, on the floor, quoted from a report of the Inspector General about certain improper practices by persons trying to come here as displaced persons. While it is true that I have not seen the report, because the report is of a confidential nature, and has been classified as secret——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. Mr. President——

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. Mr. President, the Senator is misquoting me. I have not quoted from any confidential report.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe so.

Mr. EASTLAND. No, I have not.

Mr. KILGORE. Has not the Senator quoted from a report of the Inspector General on the subject of fraud?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have not quoted from a confidential report. I have refused to do so. I said I had refused to do so. I told the distinguished majority leader that he could read the report. The report is here.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator from Mississippi give the date of the report?

Mr. EASTLAND. It would be a breach of faith, Mr. President, if I quoted from the report, even though to do so would prove my case conclusively. We tried to get it released so that we could quote from it.

Mr. KILGORE. I asked the Senator if he would give the date of the report.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I am not going to put anything in the RECORD from that report.

Mr. KILGORE. Merely the date. There is no secret about the date.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will get the consent of the State Department I will put the date in the RECORD, or I will put a part of the report in the RECORD.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the distinguished Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute, please. If the Senator gets consent, I shall do so. They have declined to permit the use of any part of that report. However, to be absolutely fair and square, I say to the Senator that, regardless of the date in the report the facts set forth in the report prove my case. If the Senator will read the report, he will realize that my conclusion is accurate.

Mr. KILGORE. If I may, I should like to ask the Senator another question: Is it not true that the report was written in 1947?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, sir; that is not correct. That is incorrect.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator state the year in which it was written?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I would be guilty of breach of faith if I used any part of the report.

Mr. KILGORE. The reason for my question is that my information indicates the report was written prior to the passage of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Then may I ask why questions of fraud in the report are being used to attack the Displaced Persons Commission? At that time the program was operating under the Immigration Service and State Department.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I told the Senator, we have used no part of the report. The Senator heard me tell him that. We have not quoted from it. The Senator heard me tell him that. I stated that if we had used the report it would have proved our case. If the Senator would read it, he would know that to be the fact.

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

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I cannot see how a report written before a governmental agency had been created could prove a case of malfeasance against that agency.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. KILGORE. I say, I cannot see how a report can impute misconduct to a governmental agency which was not in existence at the time the report was written.

Mr. EASTLAND. Who said it did? Will the Senator answer that question? Who said it did?

Mr. KILGORE. Not by direct statement, but by inference.

Mr. EASTLAND. Who by inference said it did?

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

Mr. EASTLAND. No, I should like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. KILGORE. I have heard the report quoted frequently, but I have never been able to see it, or to find the date of the report. It has always been used in committee, and I heard it used on the floor by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to impute misconduct to the employees of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Nevada can speak for himself. The Senator from West Virginia has not heard me refer to any information in the report, directly or indirectly, or attack any man named in the report because of anything contained in it. I am informed that a portion of the report was read in a meeting of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KILGORE. One paragraph.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator heard that. He knows as much about the report as I do.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. No one has seen the report in committee, except one paragraph. The Senator has not quoted from it. Just what is the reason for referring to this very mysterious document here in front of Senators?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know pretty well what is in the report.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator ought to be able to tell the Senate and the country something about the report if he is going to use it to bolster his case.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished majority leader is an influential man in the administration. The Senator from Nevada has been unable to get the report released. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Illinois could get it released. If he does, if it will destroy the chance of the substitute bill, in my judgment, or of any similar bill at this time. We have tried to get it released. We want to make it available. I know pretty well what is in the report, but I cannot use it. I am going to read from a letter which the chairman of the committee

wrote under date of January 10, 1950. I am authorized to do so. When the chairman of the committee gave me the report, he gave it to me with the admonition that it would be a breach of faith to use any information in the report, and we have been careful about that.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator is very fair and impartial.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. He knows what good conduct and good ethics are in the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator if he thinks it is a legitimate argument for him to bring in a report, pass it about in front of all Senators, talk about it, and tell the country and the world that if he could have this report made public, it would blow everything out of the water so far as the substitute bill or any other bill was concerned, yet he knows he cannot disclose it to the Senate. Why does the Senator do that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Because the people of the United States are entitled to protection, and because I know that people who have a special interest in the passage of a displaced-persons bill are deliberately sitting on that report, which is a shame. The report should be released, and I think some publicity on the report and its contents, if we could use it, would result in it being released. I am informed that a high official has stated that security would not be violated if it were released.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I still maintain that the argument is not quite fair. The Senator of course, thinks differently.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois would never bring in a report of that kind and stand before the Senate and tell the Senate of the United States, "Here is the report which, if I could get it released, would stop the bill."

Mr. EASTLAND. It certainly would, and the people of this country are entitled to information as to what is in the report; and their interests are paramount. Anything that could be legitimately done to get that report released, to shed the blessed sunlight of publicity on the facts which are being held back, would be wholesome.

Mr. President, I should like to read the letter which the chairman of the committee today has specifically authorized me to read, which he wrote the Secretary of the Army, at the Pentagon Building, attention Colonel Finn, on January 10, 1950. The letter reads:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the course of the last month there has been transmitted to me, pursuant to my request of December 5, 1949, a voluminous and detailed report of an investigation which was conducted in 1948 by a certain branch of the Army respecting security screenings and investigations of persons applying for immigration to the United States as displaced persons.

This report was transmitted to me with the condition that the contents thereof be confidential to the members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In my opinion, it is vital to the security of the United States of America that the information contained in the report be made available to the people of this country.

I should be obliged to you if you will, as soon as possible, advise me under what conditions or circumstances I may be permitted to release any or all of the information contained in the report.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

Mr. President, the report is pertinent to the present inquiry.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire where the Senator got the report?

Mr. EASTLAND. I got it from the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know where the Senator from Nevada got it?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know. He says that it was transmitted to him. I do not know where he got it. It was transmitted to him through channels of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. Can any Senator see the report?

Mr. EASTLAND. Not under the restrictions that were given. I broke faith when I said the Senator could see it. The restriction was that it would be available to the Committee on the Judiciary. It was made available, and a portion of it was read. The Senator from West Virginia said one paragraph was read. I think the report by all means should be released, without releasing, of course, the sources of information on which it is based. I believe the people of the country are entitled to it.

Mr. President, it is a startling thing.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I am intensely interested in the observations made respecting the eligibility requirements of displaced persons. Awhile ago it was disclosed on the floor that many displaced persons had considerable sums of money. Is not the whole theory of the Displaced Persons Act our desire to provide homes for those who are destitute and poverty stricken? I do not say that all displaced persons are, but in the main we must secure jobs for them and locate them when they come to this country. How does it happen that those who carry money in huge amounts, as has been stated here, are considered to be eligible, so that we have to provide homes for them?

Mr. EASTLAND. The testimony is that some of them come to this country to secure American passports in order that they may return and engage in black-market operations.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that they do not want to stay in the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a moment, please. I want to be fair about this matter. Such cases should not be charged to the whole program. Many good persons have come to the United States under the program.

Mr. WHERRY. I am simply trying to obtain the facts. It was shown by the evidence that some persons who possessed much money came in as displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to qualify that.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Mississippi heard the observations made by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. When I heard his remarks it struck me that we are trying to provide jobs for such persons. I have heard the argument made that it is cheaper to take care of them on the other side than it is in this country; but if they are good people and are entitled to citizenship, we need them. That is the argument which is made. Now we find that some of those who have come here are apparently not in need, so it would make no difference whether they would have a job or not; but they are coming here, according to the Senator from Mississippi, for entirely different purposes. Is not all that screened when the persons make application? Is not investigation made as to how much money such persons have, and as to their personal situation, when they make application?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Tripp said there are 30,000 of doubtful eligibility.

Mr. WHERRY. Thirty thousand of doubtful eligibility have come into the United States under the present law?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; out of 100,000.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I ask the Senator from Mississippi, apropos of the questions asked by the Senator from Nebraska, if it is not true that it does not necessarily follow that displaced persons are impecunious or penniless?

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. O'CONOR. They might very well have savings as the result of hard work. They may be very hard-working and self-respecting and outstanding persons who have been uprooted, and of course, require a new home. Some of them may be possessed of funds which they have obtained through hard work, and they are coming to the United States to procure a new home, after proper assurances are given that they will not displace any workingmen here.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true. But I do not see how they can get out of the iron-curtain countries within a month. The majority are good people. Those whom I know are hard-working people and have made good citizens.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Nebraska spoke of persons who when they came here had considerable sums of money. Were not those who were referred to by the Senator the persons who were testified about by the mysterious Witness X? He said that 100 persons had been mixed up in the coffee smuggling in Germany, but he cited just four cases, one of whom was in this country. Is that not correct? But there were about a hundred persons mixed up in that coffee smuggling.

Mr. EASTLAND. The whole program should not be condemned because some bad actors have come to the United States. The controversy now does not concern itself with condemnation of the program. The commitee bill would result in practically as many persons being brought here as the substitute. What we are trying to do is to root out the bad actors. The committee bill provides a better method for doing that than does the substitute.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator stated a little while ago that Mr. Tripp of the Immigration Service said about 30,000 ineligibles had come to the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. "Of doubtful eligibility," was his statement.

Mr. KILGORE. What does he mean by "doubtful eligibility"?

Mr. EASTLAND. Persons who were ineligible to come here under the displaced-persons law.

Mr. KILGORE. Does he mean ineligible as displaced persons or ineligible for immigration?

Mr. EASTLAND. He means ineligible as displaced persons; that is, persons who have come here under the displaced-persons law.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not remember that he testified to a number of 30,000. There was some question about whether they really were displaced persons. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Within the meaning of our displaced-persons law.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not that go largely to the question of whether great numbers of them said they were agriculturists, who had not followed a plow for a long time?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, it does not.

Mr. KILGORE. And the big question was not the date of entry.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. Let us not put words in Mr. Tripp's mouth. Mr. Tripp testified that under the law they were of doubtful eligibility as displaced persons.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator leave that point, will he yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose a foreigner in Germany wanted to come to this country as an immigrant, not as a displaced person. Now suppose a refugee from Latvia is in Germany and wants to come to this country as a displaced person. Are the requirements for the latter the same as for the former?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, sir.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it easier, or is it more difficult for the refugee to come here than it is for the citizen who comes in on the quota basis?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is much easier for the refugee to come here.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the procedure the Senator is recommending for the refugee the same procedure that an immigrant has to go through in coming to this country?

Mr. EASTLAND. Substantially the same.

Mr. TYDINGS. In what respect is it more severe and in what respect is it less severe.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is no more severe.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it practically the same.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is practically the same.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is however, I would take it, this difference, that the refugee would have to be funneled through more boards than an immigrant would have to be funneled through, because he must begin with a displaced persons organization.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; he must begin with IRO.

Mr. TYDINGS. In my opinion, the International Refugee Organization is a displaced persons organization.

Mr. EASTLAND. But it is a separate agency. By the committee bill we take the IRO out of the picture.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Senator is advocating, and what an immigrant coming to this country would have to go through by way of screening is that in the case of the refugee he must be accredited by the IRO in addition to what the immigrant has to go through.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. In all other respects the committee bill provides for screening with the same machinery in essence, and with the same procedures in essence, that an immigrant would have to go through if he were coming from one of the western European countries?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is substantially correct.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the committee bill, is it a fact that the Displaced Persons Commission may be reversed by the State Department?

Mr. EASTLAND. Not as to eligibility under the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. KILGORE. I call attention to the use of the word "final" in an amendment placed in the bill by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD today the order of the Displaced Persons Commission which has been adhered to, and that adjudication is final.

Mr. President, I quote further from Mr. Tripp, who speaks of screening and fingerprinting:

> Mr. TRIPP. I have not been able to find out just what those procedures are, on the fingerprint check.
>
> Question. Well, at any rate, as I understand it, leaving out the fingerprints for the moment, your information is that, although the Displaced Persons Commission requests the CIC to make this report as to the applicant's character and history and all that, the CIC sends over a communication to the Berlin Document Center asking what their records show, yet the Displaced Persons Commission has told the CIC to get work back to the Commission about this applicant without waiting for a response from the Berlin Document Center; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.
>
> Question. And they have also said the same thing to the CIC with regard to the reports from the provost marshall; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.

Mr. President, I shall digress from that testimony for a moment. The distinguished senior Senator from Maryland asked me about the difference in the bills and I inadvertently forgot to tell one principal difference.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator comes to that, and while he is on the subject I formerly questioned him concerning, let me say that this is a very comprehensive proposition in both the committee bill and the substitute. Only those members who have served on the committee and have had the good fortune to know all the facts can form the kind of judgment on it that we would all like to form. But it seems to me that the proposition of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], on the one hand, and that of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], on the other, are not so far apart but that reasonable men can get together and with a little give and take provide adequate screening without going too far and requiring too-rigid screening on the one hand or leaving the door wide open on the other. Either extreme is bad.

Mr. EASTLAND. But there is this feature: The committee bill removes the discrimination against persons of German ethnic origin. There are millions of good people who are of German ethnic origin; in fact, the real displaced persons problem is in connection with persons of German ethnic origin.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the committee bill allow them to be classified as displaced persons?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and the committee bill would permit a reasonable number of them to be admitted into the United States. But that provision is not to be found in the substitute of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland is totally presumptuous in trying to tell the members of the Judiciay Committee, who have spent weeks in studying this matter, how to deal with it. The suggestion I put forth sprang from very good motives, because after having taken part in the debate on several occasions, for the purpose of obtaining information, it is somewhat difficult for me to understand why there is not a reasonable ground for an agreement which will accomplish the objective of the bill and at the same time will protect the United States. I am a little uncertain as to why that cannot be accomplished. I do not wish anyone to surrender his principles; I do not advocate that. But it seems to me that both sides are so close together that, with a little give and take, we could have a very good bill which would not greatly alter the point of view of the Senator from Mississippi or the point of view of the Senator from West Virginia. I do not see why the matter the Senator from Mississippi has just pointed out could not be taken into consideration in that connection.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, Mr. President, I am not in charge of the bill. The Senator from Nevada is in charge of the bill.

Aside from the provision for persons of German ethnic origin, I cannot see much difference between the two bills. Aside from that question, how in the world there could be dispute over the provisions of the Senate committee bill

is something I cannot understand. There is a fuss because Mr. L'Heureux, of the State Department, requested authority for the consular service to veto an applicant on the ground that he did not qualify under the act. Some of the gentlemen associated with my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, say that authority already is provided. If so, then I cannot understand why Senators hesitate to have it provided in the bill.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the position taken by the Senator from Mississippi in his last remark shows that the door is wide open for constructive and reasonable and sensible agreement in respect to the points in conflict. The Senator himself has said that the points are not so far apart that reasonable men cannot agree.

It seems to me that the differences regarding the German ethnic origin phase of the matter, which is in dispute, are such that they could be adjusted.

Mr. EASTLAND. That question could not be compromised.

Mr. TYDINGS. No doubt it would be possible to reach agreement on the other points separately. Many of us who are not on the committee are confused about the situation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have stated time and time again that there are questions which certainly should be compromised. But there cannot be any compromise on the question of the admission of persons of German ethnic origin.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many of them would there be?

Mr. EASTLAND. The committee provision was a very reasonable one, but is was immediately ignored.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many would it provide for?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from West Virginia has the same provisions, as I understand, in his substitute; but it is meaningless, because the authorities will not enforce it. So it does not mean anything.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say a word, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor, I should like to reply to the question asked by the Senator from Maryland. The primary difference arises over a question of interpretation in respect to the IRO. Regardless of whether persons come to the United States or do not come to the United States, the United States will still have to take care of them, under the agreement.

The substitute provides for preference for approximately 54,000 persons of German ethnic origin, based upon the proposition of mortgaging the German and Austrian quotas, and still leaves the total number of displaced persons within the IRO classification, in order to carry out the agreement which the United States has through the United Nations. The committee bill throws the whole German-ethnic group in with the IRO, making, instead of, let us say, 300,000 persons with whom we must deal, 8,300,000 persons. That is the primary difference.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, to be frank, we must agree that the hard core of war displaced persons have already been taken care of.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I apologize for again injecting myself into it. But knowing the capacity of the Senator from West Virginia for constructive thinking and achievement, and likewise the talents of the able Senator from Mississippi, I would hope that those of us who have not acquired the familiarity with this problem that these two eminent members of the Judiciary Committee have, might meet tonight or at some other time between now and Monday and might ascertain whether an area of agreement can be reached, so that those of us who wish to do the right thing will be able to do so.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Mississippi and I have discussed such a modus operandi frequently in the past. Is not that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but we cannot have any agreement on the question of whether a foreign agency, an international agency, staffed with aliens, can have anything to do with the selection of the persons who are to become citizens of the United States; and I do not believe my friend, the Senator from Maryland, would vote for such a proposition.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot believe that the two Senators can fail to reach agreement regarding these things; and it would be most helpful to those of us who do not know much about these matters, to have the two Senators sit down and do that, between now and Monday. I earnestly hope they will.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I should like the Senator to permit me to read a proposed amendment which was drafted at the time when the bill was before the Senate in October, and which could be offered now. I had it drafted at that time, and had it ready for submission. It provides:

> Nor shall any displaced person be accepted for admission into the United States until he shall have been personally examined by representatives of the Displaced Persons Commission, the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, the Consular Service of the Department of State, and appropriate intelligence agencies of the Government of the United States, each of whom—

And they are not international or foreign organizations, Mr. President—

> shall certify that each such displaced person has been personally interviewed for security and other purposes; and each such report shall indicate by whom such person has been interviewed and the disposition which has been made on the basis of the interviews, field investigations, and all information developed from pertinent and relevant sources.

Mr. EASTLAND. That amendment would be all right, provided the Immigration and Naturalization Service would have authority to veto an application if the applicant did not meet those tests.

Mr. O'CONOR. Of course, they would not certify that the applicant did qualify under the tests for those purposes, unless he did.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think the Senator's amendment includes the provision I have in mind, with reference to a veto by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Of course, with that provision included, the amendment would be a very constructive one.

I read further from the testimony of Mr. Tripp:

> Question. Well, at any rate, as I understand it, leaving out the fingerprints for the moment, your information is that, although the Displaced Persons Commission requests the CIC to make this report as to the applicant's character and history and all that, the CIC sends over a communication to the Berlin Document Center asking what their records show, yet the Displaced Persons Commission has told the CIC to get word back to the Commission about this applicant without waiting for a response from the Berlin Document Center; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.
>
> Question. And they have also said the same thing to the CIC with regard to the reports from the provost marshal; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.
>
> Question. In other words, the Displaced Persons Commission, in order to expedite the handling of these displaced persons, has said, "We will take the calculated risk that may result from the failure to get those two reports"; is that right?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That is right.
>
> Question. Who is it that issued that kind of statement; do you know?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. I do not know who may have issued the instruction.
>
> Question. I mean the statement to the effect that they were willing to take the calculated risk.
>
> Mr. TRIPP. Mr. Kaplan told me that.
>
> Question. He is Mr. Squadrilli's right-hand man?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. Yes.
>
> Question. He is the man that really runs Mr. Squadrilli's office affairs?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. He is the executive assistant.
>
> Question. Where was he when he made that statement—in whose presence, and when?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. That was at Frankfurt on the day I arrived in Germany. I believe I discussed it with him again in the first month I was there.
>
> Question. Now that calculated risk that they have taken in at least the cases you have told us about was quite a risk in the 96 cases, the criminal cases, was it not?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. Yes.
>
> Question. Well, how many cases have come to you from the Displaced Persons Commission since your conversation with Mr. Kaplan in which he told you of this determination that they would accept the calculated risk?
>
> Mr. TRIPP. Around 125,000.

Mr. President, there are 125,000 cases on which the security check was not finished, and in connection with which the Displaced Persons Commission said it would take a calculated risk that such persons would not harm the United States.

I read further from the testimony:

> Question. On those 125,000 cases, am I correct in my understanding that it is your belief that there has been followed this plan of taking the calculated risk by not waiting for the Berlin Document Center, and by not

waiting for the Provost Marshal's report; is that right?

Mr. TRIPP. That is right.

Question. Now, do you think, Mr. Tripp, from your knowledge over this long period of years, that a calculated risk of that kind is a pretty serious thing for the security of our Nation.

Mr. TRIPP. I think it is dangerous.

With reference to the security investigations, Mr. Edward M. Glezek, who was formerly employed with the Displaced Persons Commission in Germany, in a report dated May 11, 1949, addressed to the Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission in Washington, stated among other things:

There is hardly an effort made to screen applicants and the burden of this activity is left to CIC, United States consulate, and law-enforcement agencies at the port of embarkation.

Mr. President, think of that. Here is a former employee of the Displaced Persons Commission saying there is hardly an effort made to screen applicants, and that the burden is borne by the CIC and the consulate at the port of embarkation. I continue:

The attitude of the Commission has been to critize the CIC agency's restricted reports as being a deterrent favor in the processing of required quota of applicants.

It appears that the Commission is more interested in filling the quota than in the quality of the processed applicants. Consequently, people who have falsified documents and who have much to hide in their personal-history records have their cases pushed along without an investigation to ascertain the validity of their documents. Thus many persons are finding their way with completely false information about themselves.

The senior officer of the Commission in the field for whom I worked has repeatedly refused to grant me permission to call the applicants for interview in order to determine their eligibility. The reason given was that this procedure would hold up the cases from 2 to 3 weeks.

Similarly, documentation which appeared incorrect could not be sent to the IRO for correction because this organization refused to correct any statement it has once certified.

In practice, there were many such incorrect certifications, and it was the duty of the Commission personnel to pass these on for further processing. Restricted CIC reports which contained derogatory information about applicants were also dealt with in the same manner, by refusal to call the applicant in for clarification.

I have in my possession copies of analyst reports of such restricted cases where I had to use an ingenious method of explaining away the remarks which were included in the CIC report, in order that these applicants may qualify.

Mr. Donald W. Main, who is a senior officer of the Displaced Persons Commission in charge of the Munich area in Germany testified before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on February 15, 1950, that although the displaced persons law requires a thorough investigation, the central intelligence agency is not given sufficient time in which to make their investigations.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator from Mississippi how long he had expected to speak?

Mr. EASTLAND. How long is the Senate expected to sit today?

Mr. LUCAS. I had hoped to adjourn probably by 6 o'clock.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have considerably more to say, but I should rather speak tomorrow, or, if the pending bill is displaced, to speak for a few minutes on another feature of the bill when it is resumed. I think the Senate can save time in that way, because I think I could cut it down to 15 or 20 minutes when we reconvene tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I was merely inquiring. I do not want to detain the Senator another hour and a half, unless he desires to continue.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the majority leader. I should rather continue tomorrow. It would not take long. If we were to recess at this time, I think I could conclude in 15 or 30 minutes tomorrow—30 minutes at the most.

Mr. LUCAS. It is agreeable to me, if it is agreeable to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may resume the floor tomorrow at 12 o'clock, when the Senate reconvenes.

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

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, March 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, humbly and confidently we are again turning to Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer, beseeching Thee to inspire us with a reassuring sense of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

Grant that with increasing tenacity of faith we may lay hold upon the glorious promise that they who wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

May we count it our highest calling to incarnate and emulate the life of our Lord and our highest wisdom to commit our baffled minds and burdened hearts to the discipline and leading of His spirit.

In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

COAL MINES SEIZURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, words need not be wasted as to the critical character of the emergency in coal. There are indications from administration sources that the President believes he has inherent powers to seize the coal mines and may do so. I ask that the President do not act except with the Congress. The Congress is in session and seizure under such conditions as the Executive alone may impose may well defeat itself in view of recent history in the coal situation, while seizure under conditions established by the Congress will insure the support of the country.

My own National Emergency Seizure Act of 1949 (H. R. 5006), giving a practical and, indeed, a liberal plan for dealing immediately and realistically with the emergency is one plan—there are other plans.

The President should immediately announce to the country that if the United Mine Workers and the mine owners have not agreed on a contract by Monday noon he will at that time present his recommendations to the Congress requesting seizure legislation or other means to deal with the crisis. The grave questions involved demand nothing less than the whole effort of Government—not just the Executive effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered last night by Franklyn B. Snyder, president emeritus of Northwestern University.

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

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two newspaper articles.

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

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio talk by R. K. Bliss entitled "Abraham Lincoln, Great Friend of Agriculture."

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter sent to him and in the other an editorial that appeared in the Boston Globe.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Kluttz.

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

There was no objection.

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

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a dangerous rider that has been placed on the oleo bill in conference modifying the Federal Trade Commission Act. I do this by inserting a copy of a telegram addressed to me pertaining to this dangerous rider. The telegram from Edward A. Zimmerman, of Chicago, Ill., reads as follows:

Hon. NOAH M. MASON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives:

Oleomargarine bill, H. R. 2023, to be reported by conference committee by Monday contains sinister addition to Trade Commission Act not confined to oleomargarine. Addition to section 5–L of Trade Commission Act in section 4–C of H. R. 2023 makes $5,000 penalty apply to each separate day of violation of Trade Commission orders which are always so general as to confuse the average businessman. This could bankrupt small business. Please investigate and take action to prevent this dangerous increase in bureaucratic police power.

AMUSEMENT TAX

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, more than 6,000 residents of my district have recently written me urging that relief be accorded taxpayers still compelled to pay a 20-percent tax on theater admissions and other forms of amusement.

The 11 Democratic members of the Paterson, N. J., Board of Aldermen have resolved that this tax is a real burden upon ordinary citizens seeking entertainment and they plead for relief.

I agree with my people and I am glad to see them exercising their right of petition in this way. More than a year ago when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] introduced his excise-tax relief bill, I announced publicly my support. Last year I signed the discharge petition to force this measure to the floor. I am sorry that the President in his recent tax message failed to suggest any relief from this tax. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I hope administration forces in the House will soon report out a bill. All I want is a chance to vote.

DISLOYAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I picked up this morning's paper and saw an article by Bert Andrews in the Washington Post to the effect that President Truman said yesterday that he is the only one in the Government who has taken concrete action to rid Federal agencies of disloyal persons.

Since I have been a Member of Congress I have been watching the work that has been done by the Dies committee and the Un-American Activities Committee, and then have seen the statements made by the Chief Executive about drawing a red herring across the trail in the case of Communists they have brought to light. It just does not make sense that a man who has the high office of President of the United States would make a statement of that kind. It is repugnant and repulsive to the average American citizen, when he knows that that is not the condition. Oh, for honest men in high office.

FEDERAL AMUSEMENT EXCISE TAX

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have received thousands of communications from my congressional district urging the repeal of the Federal amusement excise tax which was imposed during the war. I follow the practice of answering so far as possible every letter I receive from a resident of my congressional district. However, so many thousands of letters are coming in to me daily urging the repeal of the wartime nuisance excise taxes that I find it impossible with the staff available to me to make personal answers to these letters. I issued a news release some time ago announcing that I favor the repeal of these taxes as I believe we should keep the promise we made when the taxes were imposed that they would be repealed when the war ended.

Furthermore, the continuation of these nuisance taxes is impeding business, adding to the unemployed rolls and in the long run will not bring in as large revenues to the Federal Government as would be the case if they are repealed.

I introduced H. R. 7382 which has for its purpose the repeal of these excise taxes and I have also signed Discharge Petition No. 5 to bring out H. R. 2100, Representative MARTIN'S bill having the same purpose and I have urged the Ways and Means Committee of the House to report the bill out so that we may act on it without further delay.

I hope all of my correspondents in my congressional district whose letters I have not been able to answer will note my position on this legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain resolutions passed by the Georgia Legislature.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Tax Review, written by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some material from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of February 20.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Pope Pius XII Living Symbol of Peace."

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

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

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ORDER WIPING OUT SEGREGATION IN OUR ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE REVOKED AT ONCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest blunders that could possibly have been made at this time was the President's order wiping out segregation in our armed forces.

If we should get into another conflict, it would do more to cripple our national defense than anything else that has taken place since Pearl Harbor.

I am appealing to the President through this record to revoke that order at once and not let it cripple our national defense in this critical hour.

The country has just witnessed a tragic example when a bomber plane was turned over to a Bolivian Negro who could not pass the examination for a pilot's license in this country. The result was one of the most disastrous airplane crashes this country ever saw, in which he killed 58 of the finest Americans who ever lived, including a distinguished Member of the Congress of the United States.

I do not know who advised the President to issue this order, but I sincerely

hope that he will realize its dangers and revoke it at once, and not permit it to cripple our armed forces or to injure our program of national defense at this critical time.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee To Investigate Crime and Criminal Conditions of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL and Mr. JOHNSON asked and were given permission to revise and extend the remarks they expect to make today in Committee of the Whole on the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills and include extraneous matter.

EXECUTIVE ORDER OF THE PRESIDENT ABOLISHING SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take exception to the comments which the gentleman from Mississippi made in regard to the President's executive order. I think if there ever was a time in the history of the world when we should subscribe to democratic principles and when we should forget the differences in color, the differences in race, and the differences in religion, it is today. There is no distinction in the eyes of God of any human being. We know that from the study of the Holy Scriptures. We realize that a human being, regardless of his race, his color, or his creed, is a child of God in the eyes of God. Our founding fathers made provisions that all men should be equal and have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Certainly, as long as discrimination exists in our Nation we are not fully democratic, and as long as discrimination is extant in the most famous and leading democracy in the world, we cannot set an example to the millions of people of other races and creeds, to whom we extol the virtues of democracy and upon whom we seek to impress the fact that we do believe in the real principles of democracy. The President's executive order against race discrimination in our armed services is, in my opinion, a long overdue extension of the principle of democracy. If a colored man is worthy to serve in our armed services and offer his life in the service of his country, he is worthy of equality of treatment and the full privileges of our democracy.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take exception to the remarks of the gentleman from California who preceded me. Further, I wish to interpose an objection to an order issued by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the President which abolishes segregation in the armed forces of the United States.

I believe that I can speak with some authority on this subject because I served in the armed forces for over 5 years. Following 2 years of continuous service in the south Pacific theater of war, I returned to the United States and was assigned duty at the United States Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex. In addition to my regular duties at Corpus Christi I was assigned special duty during the month of March or April 1944 as officer of the day at the station. I served in such capacity, subject only to the orders of the commanding officer of the station, from 8 o'clock in the evening until 8 o'clock in the morning. I well recall one incident which timely illustrates specifically what the results of the nonsegregation order will mean. On this particular occasion I was notified by the officer in charge of the station dispensary that three men had just been admitted and were suffering from multiple abrasions and lacerations. I was further informed that a fight was taking place near the barracks area. Upon investigation, I found approximately one hundred and fifty or two hundred men of the white and colored races in what is commonly called "a race riot or free for all." To dispel this unfortunate situation it was necessary for me to call out both the seamen guard and marine detachment assigned to the base. After due time, order was restored but not until after twenty-five to fifty men had been injured.

Proper investigation was made by the commanding officer and others responsible for the good order and discipline of the base. As a result of such investigation, it was the conclusion of all concerned that the primary cause of the altercation was the effort to impose and require compulsory integration of the two races.

The compulsory nonsegregation order will injure and endanger our national defense system and organization more than the Communist Party. It will cause an untold amount of dissension and insurrection among the ranks of our fighting men. That is true regardless of what anyone has to say about civil rights.

The racial problem is without doubt one of the greatest this country faces. However, that problem cannot be cured or solved by legislative fight or executive order or proclamation. It can only be solved by education, tolerance, understanding, religious teaching, and time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] has expired.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH, SCIENCE, AND COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health, Science, and Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, for a number of months, dispatches from the Associated Press have reported statements appearing in newspapers of the Arab countries which indicate they are looking to the next round of their war with the Israeli. They assert that the conflict temporarily concluded was but a preliminary skirmish and that there will be no doubt of the outcome of the next engagement. The receipt of vast quantities of arms from England adds fuel to their flame and gives substance to their threat.

The situation to preserve peace in the Middle East has deteriorated steadily. The arming of the Arabs has continued at a steady pace. Apparently, Egypt has made available to other Arab nations a portion of the weapons she received from Britain. In the meantime our State Department has steadfastly looked in other directions, making no protest to England and totally ignoring the alarming developments in the Middle East.

If our aim is to preserve peace by furnishing assistance to the people of all democratic nations so they may live free from the theat of aggression by outside powers, as has been stated on many occasions by our Secretary of State, then we must use our influence before it is too late. Permitting the flow of jet planes and Sherman tanks to one of the parties to a temporary armistice rather than to both on an equal basis, is not calculated to bring an eventual peaceful and equitable adjustment of an emotional dispute, which is still far from settled. The argument by the State Department that the cold war requires the present flow of arms to the Arab countries is difficult indeed to accept without a corresponding opportunity being given to Israel to participate in the same program, particularly in view of the fact that the Israeli have already proved themselves against overwhelming odds much more accomplished in defending their land than have the aggressors.

Mr. Speaker, the time for preventive action by this Government is not after the shooting has started. It is urgent that the State Department act to check the flow of arms to the Arab countries now.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on the case for home rule in Washington.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] frequently berate the President because he says the President has not done anything about communism, and then beat his breast about Communists and tell what great things are being done in the House about communism. Frankly, the House has not done much about communism, except talk about it.

I have a bill pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to bar the Communist Party from using the mails to disseminate their propaganda. My colleague from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] has a bill pending to bar the Communist Party from the Federal ballot. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] would like to do something about the Communists, there is a chance for him, and those who talk so much about communism to get behind those two bills and bring them out and pass them.

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

LEW DESCHLER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that under the Constitution the final voice on judicial matters and the final decision of legal questions of a constitutional nature and other legal questions is the Supreme Court of the United States. We who have served in the House of Representatives, and those who have served in the past, know that the final voice in the House on parliamentary questions is the Speaker; the House, of course, really having the final voice on appeal but rarely exercising it. We are all proud of the employees of the House organization, and particularly are we proud of its unofficial supreme court on parliamentary law, if I may use that expression, the Parliamentarian of the House, Lew Deschler. Today is his birthday, and I extend to him my congratulations and the congratulations of all the other Members of the House. A fine family man, a fine husband, a fine father, a fine character, these are a few of his other qualities that endear him to us.

We are all proud to know Lew Deschler, and we are all proud of the great capacity that is his and the great contributions that he makes to the proceedings of this great body of the Congress.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wish to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in extending felicitations to our genial Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. The longer I serve here the more I am convinced that those critics of the House of Representatives who on occasion assail us because of our so-called antiquated methods, do not really understand or comprehend the work that is done here. The rules of the House of Representatives have grown up through the years. The remarkable thing about these rules is that operating under them a body such as this, comprising 435 Members, is able to move expeditiously, wisely, and effectively in accomplishing the legislation that comes before it. I may add also that the longer I serve here the more I realize the supreme importance of the correct application of the rules of the House, for they are so all-important. As the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, it is, of course, the responsibility of the Speaker to make the rulings on questions that arise from day to day as we carry on our labors, but we also realize that back of the Speaker we find the Parliamentarian.

I have watched the work of Lew Deschler. I know from my experience here that if the rules are to be properly applied and if our work is to go forward as it should, the man who advises the Speaker must be, first of all, completely familiar with the rules and all of the precedents that go with those rules; and, furthermore, he must be a man of complete objectivity, whose decisions are never colored or flavored with personal friendship or partisanship. We have that in our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. I wish for him many, many more years of continuing life and happiness; and, yes, may I say, service with us here in the House of Representatives. While, of course, we will never admit that any one man is indispensable, yet if any one man does approach indispensability, that man is Lew Deschler in his service here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend from Indiana.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a Representative from the State of Ohio, I am especially appreciative of the words spoken by the gentleman from Massachusetts and by the gentleman from Indiana about a great Ohioan, Lew Deschler. The great Buckeye State has given many men to the public service and we are proud of the record that our contributions in the way of manhood and womanhood to the Nation have made to its welfare. Lew Deschler is one of the men of whom Ohio can justly be proud and the State of Ohio, not only its Representatives in the Congress but every citizen in my State, joins in felicitations to Lew Deschler on this his natal day.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Probably no man in this House has engaged in more parliamentary battles than I have since I have been a Member of this body.

I have closely followed and scrutinized the work of our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler.

I have never known any man in that position who served better, more diligently, and more wisely than Lew Deschler. In his position he wields a tremondous power, because invariably legislation of the most vital importance turns upon a question of parliamentary procedure. I endorse all that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has said and all the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has said about Mr. Deschler, and I want to add my years of experience here in which, as I stated, I have engaged in many parliamentary battles.

I do not believe there is a finer parliamentarian on earth than Lew Deschler.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, all of these words are very nice, but, when I was chairman of the Legislative Committee, we did something about it. Our committee raised his pay.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say that back of Lew Deschler is that faithful and that charming girl who is his wife, and also his dear mother. Everything that every Member has said on this occasion in relation to Lew Deschler is also addressed to Mrs. Deschler and to his mother.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 331, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the speakers who follow me will bring to the attention of the Committee many of the economic facts in reference to Alaska. We will try to make our arguments as brief as possible, yet present to the membership facts that we feel are pertinent and will give them information on this important subject.

A long series of hearings have been held from time to time on this matter. The hearings which you now have are not the only ones. This is the result of

many other hearings, resolutions, and endorsements over a period of years that have come to the attention of the committee, showing a gradual upward growth of this great area in fitting itself for statehood.

Shortly after the purchase of Alaska, which was criticized at that time, it was found that within a single year many, many times more than the entire purchase price found its way to the United States.

As early as August 1869 Secretary of State Seward, at Sitka, Alaska, made this statement:

> Fellow citizens of the United States, within the period of my own recollection I have seen 20 new States added to the 18 which before that time constituted the American Union, and I now see, besides Alaska, 10 territories in a forward condition of preparation for entering into the same great political family. These citzens of Sitka are the guaranties not only that Alaska has a future, but that future has already begun, first as a Territory and ultimately as a State—

Showing very clearly that the United States Government recognized at that time that the ultimate destiny of this great area was to become a member of the Sisterhood of States to which he referred at that time. Each in their turn has become a valuable member to this Union.

With reference to population: Nevada, among the States to which he refers, had less population at the time it came into the Union, and many others had considerably less population at the time they came into the Union, and many others had considerably less than has Alaska at the present time.

Nevada, when she came into the Union, had a population of 42,491. Vermont was one of the larger ones when she came into the Union with 85,000. My own State of Florida only had 72,000, less than two-thirds of the present population of Alaska. California had 92,000; that was one of the larger ones. Oregon only had 52,000. So, on a population basis Alaska has shown that she does have the population, but in addition to that, if she can secure statehood, there will be the chance for still further orderly development of that area.

Both platforms of the two major political parties definitely pledged statehood for Alaska. The President, in his address to the Congress, again reiterated that pledge at the beginning of this session.

I shall attempt to give you some of the high spots but, as I said before, I leave much of that to those who will succeed me.

Alaska's commercial ties with continental United States by the end of 1944, that is the volume of trade between these two areas since 1906, had a value of almost $4,000,000,000. Some $2,500,000 represented the value of Alaska's shipment to the United States of fish products, fish and frozen fish, canned and preserved animal products, mineral products, wood and lumber; a vast storehouse of minerals.

Oftentimes we talk about bureaucracy; oftentimes we also talk about absentee landlordism. This is one of the States which, if we will grant statehood to Alaska, will be the means whereby we will divest bureaucracy of what might be a bureaucrat's dream with those vast forests, those vast fur farms, those vast fisheries, and that sort of thing. Alaska, if not taken into the sisterhood of States, could be actually a bureaucrat's dream, and we are trying to divest that, and the Bureau and Department approves this bill.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I think we are all fully aware of the fact that Alaska has a substantial population and has all of these resources and assets that the distinguished gentleman from Florida is setting forth here. But, what facilities are there in Alaska, along the line of roads and means of transportation, that will permit the people in the backward areas to avail themselves of the opportunity to go to the polls to vote when they have to elect their Senators and Representatives?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Abbitt	Gilmer	Murphy
Albert	Granahan	Norrell
Allen, La.	Green	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Patten
Barrett, Pa.	Hardy	Pfeiffer, William L.
Beall	Hart	Plumley
Bennett, Fla.	Havenner	Powell
Bentsen	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Biemiller	Hedrick	Redden
Blackney	Heffernan	Rich
Blatnik	Heller	Roosevelt
Boggs, Del.	Herter	Sabath
Bolton, Md.	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadowski
Brooks	Holifield	Sasscer
Buchanan	Huber	Scott, Hardie
Buckley, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Shafer
Burdick	James	Shelley
Burton	Kelley, Pa.	Smathers
Byrne, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Ohio
Cannon	Keogh	Stanley
Carroll	Klein	Steed
Cavalcante	Kunkel	Stigler
Celler	Latham	Taylor
Chatham	Lichtenwalter	Towe
Chudoff	Lyle	Vorys
Clemente	Lynch	Vursell
Clevenger	McGrath	Wadsworth
Coudert	Mack, Ill.	Whitaker
Davenport	Macy	White, Calif.
Davies, N. Y.	Marcantonio	White, Idaho
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Widnall
Douglas	Miles	Wilson, Okla.
Eaton	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Eberharter	Monroney	Withrow
Ellsworth	Morgan	Woodhouse
Engle, Calif.	Morris	
Fogarty	Morrison	
Gavin	Moulder	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 331) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 318 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, at the time the call came one of my colleagues had asked with reference to the people getting to the communities for the purpose of voting and the improvements in those areas. I may say that the public works bill which we passed during the last session of the present Congress will be of material assistance in their public improvements. In addition to that, if they get statehood, then they can, as many other States have, provide for farm-to-market roads and other local roads and may participate under the regular Federal highway system.

Even aside from that, under the situation we are in today, in the elections which they had they already polled a greater percentage of votes than they did in many of the States of the Union.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How many registered voters do they have in the entire Territory?

Mr. PETERSON. I do not know the number of registered voters offhand, but about 34 percent participated in the last election, and there is about 100,000 or more population.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there anything in the hearings that would indicate how many registered voters there are in the Territory?

Mr. PETERSON. In several of the hearings, yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that there are only about 21,000 or 22,000 registered voters?

Mr. PETERSON. The Delegate from Alaska can give us exact figures. Thirty-four percent of the registered voters participated.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not talking about that; I am talking about the number of people involved. The gentleman said that the percentage is large, but I am inquiring as to the number.

Mr. PETERSON. I will yield to the Delegate from Alaska to give us the exact number of votes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Twenty-two thousand people voted in the last election.

Mr. COOLEY. Twenty-two thousand in the whole Territory.

Mr. BARTLETT. Which is, of course, larger than the votes in several of the congressional districts.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the percentage of natives of the total population?

Mr. BARTLETT. About one-third.

Mr. PETERSON. That is in the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know how many Federal employees are now employed in Alaska?

Mr. PETERSON. I do not have it offhand, but it was in some of the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. About 20,000, is it not?

Mr. PETERSON. It varies from time to time as certain activities there increase.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not about 20,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. The number of civil-service employees last year was somewhere between four and five thousand. There were, of course, other employees on defense projects.

Mr. PETERSON. That does not include the armed services.

Mr. COOLEY. One-fourth of the population of Alaska is on the Federal pay roll at the present time.

Mr. PETERSON. If we get statehood, we can change the picture; we can divest ourselves of bureaucratic control. I am not criticizing control as such, but if we can give them statehood instead of trying to administer it here by Federal employees, the picture will change.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one additional question. How can the people of Alaska make more progress as a State than they are now making as a Territory?

Mr. PETERSON. History shows that every Territory, after it acquired statehood, made progress thereafter. Alaska today has a very good economic showing; a better economic showing than one-fourth of the States of the Union when they came into statehood.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, that is just a hope. In other words, the gentleman's committee hopes that by virtue of being a State the people will be attracted to Alaska who are not now attracted.

Mr. PETERSON. History shows that that is the case. History shows that that is the situation, and local government can work and develop much further than you can by having it administered from Washington.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that no single instance that he has cited is comparable with the situation that we are now dealing with. We are dealing with a Territory that is twice the size of the great State of Texas, with a population spread over a vast area clear beyond the Arctic Circle.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, but at the time other States came into the Union their populations were scattered, too.

Mr. COOLEY. But you did not have such a wide area and you did not have any such terrific variety of climate as we are now dealing with.

Mr. PETERSON. Well, there is some very good climate in this area.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina if he is contending that during the past two decades the people of this country have lost all spirit of adventure, all spirit of initiative, all spirit of enterprise, and that they will no longer go to a vast empire like Alaska because they are afraid to go there, when he ought to know that Alaska has what is known as a Banana Belt where the climate is as acceptable to the people as Seattle, Wash.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does not know any such thing.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman knows I have been very friendly toward Alaska and very much interested in Alaska.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. My information has been that there are about 90,000 people in Alaska.

Mr. PETERSON. We estimate about 100,000. It is estimated from 95,000 to 105,000.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. There are about 20,000 Government employees and 40,000 Indians, and they are very high-type Indians and Eskimos. The other 30,000 are whites. That is about right; is it not?

Mr. PETERSON. They are different figures from what we had. We do not have that many Federal employees.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Less than 100,000 altogether. I cannot reconcile myself to give two United States Senators and a Congressman and three electoral votes to a group of people who have less than one-third of the population of my own district, although I am for Alaska and I want to help Alaska if I can.

Mr. PETERSON. I represent a large district, but history would show that Alaska has a population greater than 12 of the States when they came into the Union.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us see if we cannot straighten this out. Who is there on this floor that is contending that Federal employees who have their voting rights in the continental United States go to Alaska and vote in the elections to which the Delegate has referred? Let me ask the Delegate from Alaska, who did the voting up there?

Mr. BARTLETT. The permanent residents of Alaska, in a number we estimate at about 100,000, not these seasonal workers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They own property there and live there?

Mr. BARTLETT. Alaska is their home.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am really surprised that the gentleman from Michigan, who is on the Committee on Appropriations, with all the detailed study he has made of Alaska, made the argument he did.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if it is a fact or not a fact that Federal employees in the Territory are allowed to vote and do vote there?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course, if they live there all the time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope you will all give me very close attention, because I believe I can answer some of the questions that have been raised here in this debate.

I have a very high regard for the Delegate from Alaska, but I have a greater regard for the welfare of the United States of America and for my people in California. I think the passage of this bill would be the greatest distortion of representative government we have ever had in America.

The last speaker mentioned the fact that 12 States of the Union came in with populations less than Alaska now has, and that is true. However, the ratio of the population of Alaska to the total population is 1 to 1,532. The ratio of Florida, for instance, one of the States the chairman mentioned, and also his home State, at the time it came into the Union, was 1 to 264. All those States had a far greater ratio of their population to the total population, so the argument that 12 other States came in with a smaller population does not have the slightest validity. It points up graphically one weakness in Alaska's plea for statehood. Over half the States when they came into the Union had less than 25 percent of the divergence in population ratio that we have in Alaska today.

Just think what this means for a moment. In my State last year we cast over 4,000,000 votes. In Alaska they cast 22,309. Two Senators from that State could nullify the votes of two Senators from our State, who were sent here by over 4,000,000 voters. In a treaty fight, which might be vital to the security of the United States, two Senators from this new State, very small in population, could nullify the votes of Senators representing 10,000,000 voters in California and 15,000,000 in New York, or 25,000,000 altogether. Here are some facts and figures, which the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress prepared at my request that graphically illustrate the argument I have made and will make in opposition to this bill. They should convince any biased person that statehood for Alaska is absolutely impractical now as the Territory is not yet ready for it.

ALASKA: SELECTED DATA CONCERNING POPULATION, ASSESSABLE PROPERTY, PROBLEMS OF STATEHOOD

I. COMPARISON OF ALASKAN POPULATION AND VOTING WITH SELECTED STATES

State	Population (1949 estimate)	Times greater than Alaskan population	Vote cast for President in 1948	Times greater than Alaskan vote for Delegate
New York	14,392,000	153.1	6,111,530	273.9
California	10,665,000	113.5	4,031,538	180.7
Pennsylvania	10,633,000	113.1	3,735,087	167.4
Illinois	8,449,000	89.9	3,984,046	178.6
Ohio	7,989,000	85.0	2,936,071	131.6
Texas	7,532,000	80.1	1,147,245	51.4
Washington	2,582,000	27.5	878,875	39.4
Florida	2,494,000	26.5	578,358	25.9
Oklahoma	2,302,000	24.5	721,599	32.3
Maryland	2,175,000	23.1	596,748	26.7
Mississippi	2,130,000	22.7	192,190	8.6
Connecticut	2,019,000	21.5	883,518	39.6
New Hampshire	544,000	5.8	231,440	10.4
Montana	521,000	5.5	219,051	9.8
Vermont	369,000	3.9	123,382	5.5
Delaware	311,000	3.3	139,073	6.2
Wyoming	284,000	3.0	101,425	4.5
Nevada	174,000	1.9	62,117	2.8

II. VALUE OF ASSESSABLE PROPERTY IN ALASKA

Municipalities in Alaska are permitted to levy a 3 percent property tax. According to the 1948 Annual Report of the Governor of Alaska, Alaska had 26 incorporated towns whose assessed valuation totaled $91,611,126, an increase of $19,491,881 over 1947. Moody's

1950 Governments and Municipals gives the following figures for Alaska:

Assessed value

Unit	All property	Real	Year	Basis
Anchorage independent school district	$38,751,545		1949–50	Pct. 55
Fairbanks	16,060,624		1949	80
Fairbanks school district	22,982,560		1948 [1]	
Juneau	12,931,575	$12,191,914	1948	100
Ketchikan	15,191,635	11,623,240	1947	75
Petersburg	1,440,000		1944	100
Sitka	2,751,525		1949	100
	110,109,464			

[1] Jan. 1.

A general property tax was passed by the territorial legislature during its 1949 session. A complete valuation has not yet been made on the basis of this new tax. Estimates, however, place the valuation of property outside municipalities at approximately $150,000,000 and for municipalities at $105,000,000.

III

A. Population data concerning States having same or less population than Alaska at date of admission

State	Year of admission	Population at admission [1]	Total United States population [2]	Ratio of State to National population
Delaware	1787	59,096	3,929,214	1:66
Georgia	1788	82,548	3,929,214	1:47
Rhode Island	1790	68,825	3,929,214	1:57
Vermont	1791	85,425	3,929,214	1:46
Kentucky	1792	73,677	3,929,214	1:53
Tennessee	1796	105,602	5,308,483	1:50
Ohio	1803	45,365	5,308,483	1:117
Louisiana	1812	76,556	7,239,881	1:94
Indiana	1816	[1] 63,897	9,638,453	1:150
Mississippi	1817	75,448	9,638,453	1:127
Illinois	1818	55,211	9,638,453	1:174
Missouri	1821	66,586	9,638,453	1:144
Arkansas	1836	97,574	17,069,453	1:174
Florida	1845	87,445	23,191,876	1:265
California	1850	92,597	23,191,876	1:250
Oregon	1859	52,466	31,443,321	1:599
Nevada	1864	42,491	35,558,371	1:836
Nebraska	1865	[1] 88,530	[2] 35,700,678	1:403
Wyoming	1890	62,555	62,947,714	1:1006
Idaho	1890	88,548	62,947,714	1:710
Alaska		94,000	148,720,000	1:1582

[1] Closest census year, except in the case of Indiana and Nebraska which are approximate figures at dates of admission. First Annual Report of the Indiana Department of Statistics and Geology, 1879, and the Congressional Globe, Dec. 14, 1866.

[2] Closest census year, except for Nebraska which is estimated continental population figure for 1865; taken from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1948, p. 9.

B. Population increases of selected States for 10-year period before admission, in comparison with Alaskan gain, 1940–49

State	Year admitted	Population		Percent gain
Arkansas	1836	(1820) 14,273	(1830) 30,388	113
Indiana	1816	(1800) 5,641	(1810) 24,520	335
Maine	1820	(1810) 228,705	(1820) 298,335	30
Arizona	1912	(1900) 122,931	(1910) 204,354	66
Utah	1896	(1880) 143,963	(1890) 210,779	46
Alaska		(1940) 72,524	(1949) 94,000	30

C. Lands under Federal jurisdiction

State or Territory	Total area [1]	Total area under Federal jurisdiction [2]	Percent
	Acres	*Acres*	
Alaska	365,481,600	[3] 365,000,000	99
Alabama	32,689,920	1,099,722	3
Arizona	72,691,200	50,471,920	69
Arkansas	33,744,000	3,031,431	9

See footnotes at end of table.

C. Lands under Federal jurisdiction—Con.

State or Territory	Total area [1]	Total area under Federal jurisdiction [2]	Percent
	Acres	*Acres*	
California	100,353,920	45,900,157	46
Colorado	66,538,880	24,851,005	37
Connecticut	3,135,360	15,714	[4]
Delaware	1,265,920	40,603	3
Florida	34,727,680	2,851,207	8
Georgia	37,451,520	1,831,193	5
Idaho	52,997,120	34,285,000	65
Illinois	35,806,080	448,992	1
Indiana	23,171,200	336,952	1
Iowa	35,831,040	105,310	[4]
Kansas	52,552,320	323,118	[4]
Kentucky	25,669,760	946,131	4
Louisiana	28,913,280	1,053,161	4
Maine	19,865,600	143,131	[4]
Maryland	6,327,680	229,392	4
Massachusetts	5,060,480	52,671	1
Michigan	36,494,080	2,709,428	7
Minnesota	51,205,760	3,819,665	7
Mississippi	30,348,800	1,484,713	5
Missouri	44,332,800	1,641,502	4
Montana	93,642,240	34,218,875	37
Nebraska	49,057,920	735,224	1
Nevada	70,273,280	59,526,959	85
New Hampshire	5,775,360	682,600	12
New Jersey	4,814,080	96,462	2
New Mexico	77,767,040	35,479,713	46
New York	30,674,560	358,214	[4]
North Carolina	31,450,880	1,927,562	6
North Dakota	44,834,560	2,651,898	6
Ohio	26,318,080	259,156	1
Oklahoma	44,341,120	3,891,209	9
Oregon	61,664,000	32,510,870	53
Pennsylvania	28,828,800	590,522	2
Rhode Island	677,120	18,917	3
South Carolina	19,580,160	912,702	5
South Dakota	48,983,040	8,610,766	18
Tennessee	26,855,040	1,646,281	6
Texas	168,732,160	2,246,572	1
Utah	52,701,440	37,592,044	71
Vermont	5,937,920	694,184	12
Virginia	25,535,360	2,078,615	8
Washington	42,865,280	14,998,067	35
West Virginia	15,417,600	1,289,062	8
Wisconsin	35,017,600	2,243,003	6
Wyoming	62,403,840	32,207,086	52

[1] Figures from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1948, p. 160.

[2] Figures for State compiled by John Jackson, Legislative Reference Service, October 1949.

[3] Estimate given by Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

[4] Less than 1 percent.

D. Comments on problems presented by Alaskan statehood

Congressional Digest, volume 26, No. 11, November 1947:

"But the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska today is somewhat different from the situations which faced Congress in respect to admission of the existing States.

"Here, for the first time, Congress is faced with two entirely new facts of the problem.

"One of these is the matter of distance and contiguity. As the history of the formation of the United States will show every new State that has been added to the Union has been located in such a manner that it borders upon existing States or existing Territories of the United States at the time of its admission. But between Hawaii and the nearest point of United States mainland lie 2,400 miles of Pacific Ocean. And between Alaska and the United States lie 870 miles of Canadian land.

"The second point involves a racial question. The populations of existing States, at the time of their admission to the Union, were made up largely of third-, fourth-, or fifth-generation Americans plus some American Indians and Caucasion immigrants from Europe, whose characteristics and background were well known and understood. Both Hawaii and Alaska present populations that are decidedly racial mixtures. Hawaii's people are one-third Japanese, one-third native, and one-third Caucasian; Alaska's people are about half Caucasian and half Eskimo or Indian.

"These conditions are the source of considerable speculation as to the wisdom of bringing the two Territories into the Union. And as pointed out, the problems they pose to Congress are unique."

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions of the Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, first session, pursuant to House Resolution 93:

Testimony of Mr. W. C. Arnold, managing director of the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., page 155 and following: "I do not think that this Territory can develop until some stable transportation system is effected where goods can move into and out of this Territory on a stable basis at a reasonable rate. We do not have such a system now and I fail to see how the Territory can develop, how it can arrive at a status where statehood would be desirable, until that problem can be solved. * * *

* * * * * *

"There has been much said about the ability of the Territory to support statehood. I make no particular comment upon that, but to judge by the past, and the past demonstrates conclusively that whether the people are able to support statehood or not, they certainly are not willing to support it, because they have not been willing to support the Territorial institutions either and have not contributed anything of consequence by way of taxation themselves but have been content to have the revenue such as could be extracted from the nonresident sources."

Eighty-first Congress, first session, House of Representatives, Report No. 255, to accompany H. R. 331, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union: "The chief argument of those opposed to statehood now was that Alaska could not support the cost of statehood. This cost, over and above what Alaska now pays for its Territorial government, was estimated at $1,645,000 by the proponents of statehood, and at $5,857,500 by the opponents. Among the additional expenses which Alaska would have to bear are the salaries of the Governor and the Secretary of Alaska, all, instead of part of, the cost of the legislature, the State court system, the fishery administration, and the care of the insane."

Annual report of the Governor of Alaska, 1947, page 1: "At the first referendum ever devoted in the Territory to the question of statehood, the people voted in favor of it by 9,630 to 6,822. This referendum had been provided by the seventeenth Territorial legislature meeting in the late winter of 1945, to take place at the following general election on October 8, 1946. The 1946, as well as the 1947, legislature, likewise passed memorials to Congress asking for statehood. The more populous divisions, the first and third, gave substantial majorities, the first by 3,872 for to 1,953 against; the third by 3,427 for to 2,257 against. The two northern divisions, however, which together cast less than one-third of the total vote in the Territory, reported slight majorities against statehood, the second by 191 votes, the fourth by 90 votes. However, both their principal cities, Nome and Fairbanks, voted for statehood."

Those are the things we have to think about when we think about the situation in Alaska.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it the gentleman's argument, then, that small States like Nevada and other such States with small population should withdraw from the Union?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not at all, sir.

Mr. ANGELL. They are in identically the same position as Alaska.

Mr. JOHNSON. No; the situation is not the same. I am confident when the Constitution was drawn, giving equality

of representation in the Senate, the founding fathers never had in mind that there would be such a wide divergence in the population of the various States. It is true that Nevada has only 1.2 percent of the population of California. I am not criticizing that situation. The situation is there, but I do not want to carry that principle still further, and further distort the situation as it would be in the upper Chamber, if Alaska, with its 22,309 voters, were admitted.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it contemplated within a short period of time, I do not know how long a time, after this bill becomes law—if it does become law—the membership of the House will revert to its present number, that is 435, and that such representation as is given to Alaska in the House will be taken from some State within the continental limits of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON. That would have to happen in the nature of things, unless the membership of the House was increased.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, it would.

Mr. JOHNSON. There would have to be a reapportionment, unless some other provision were made for this new Member. There will be a reapportionment in 1950 by virtue of a law now on the books.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In other words, some Member of the House of Representatives is going to be retired as the result of this legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON. That may be true.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, I want to point out that the history has been that every time a new State was admitted to the Union, an increase was made in the number of Representatives. Today we have 435 Members and 2 Delegates. The Delegates do not vote, but they get the same emoluments. It is contemplated, therefore, in the Eighty-second Congress that they can take care of that situation.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the 1950 census the State of Pennsylvania will lose one seat, and perhaps two. Can the gentleman assure us that the two seats which will be given to Hawaii or Alaska will not come from the Pennsylvania representation?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know where they will come from. They will come from somewhere, but I do not know just where.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the first statement that I want to make on this bill is that I personally am not so selfish and so anxious to stay in the House of Representatives as a Member, that I would deny citizens of the United States their constitutional rights. If I ever get to the point where I am in that frame of mind, I hope that my people will take me from this body forever and keep me out of it.

Did our forefathers take the position that our minority groups should not be permitted to come into the Union as a State? If they did, then why were the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska incorporated into the Union by previous Congresses when we know that having been incorporated as Territories they might eventually become States of the Union?

I wish some bright, brilliant mind would answer that question, if the argument is going to be made that these minority people are not entitled to statehood.

Thirdly, I point this out. The two Senators from the State I have the honor to represent can neutralize the votes of the two Senators from any other State in the other body, and you do not need to make the argument that only the two Senators from Alaska or the two Senators from Hawaii can neutralize the votes of the two Senators of other States.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman will recall that Senator Borah, from the little State of Idaho, exercised perhaps more influence in the Congress of the United States than any other one man down through the years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, and perhaps more than any other 15 men.

Here is a proposition. Some people may criticize me from my State for saying this, but suppose my State becomes extremely radical and suppose we elect two Senators who are as far to the left as men could go. What are you going to do about it? Why, you will let them sit in the other body. That is exactly what you would do about it. With the kind of bloc voting that we have in this country today such might be possible. Such a representation from any State could do as much damage in the other body as any other group could do if they were elected from the Territory of Hawaii or Alaska. We are supposed to be fairly literate. I am going to try to follow logical reasoning. If I cannot win on that basis, I will take my medicine in defeat.

You have really got two bills before you. You have got the Alaskan statehood bill and you have got the Hawaiian statehood bill. These two areas, the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii, are two pivot areas in the defense of the whole world, outside of Russia.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not now. These are pivot points. Who is to be attacked first, according to the present philosophy? Those two areas. Those are the first points to be attacked, and those were the two points attacked by Japan in December of 1941; and they took this one, Hawaii, and destroyed practically everything we had there. Today, if we can accept the statement of our chiefs of staff, and other responsible men, what have you got up here in Alaska to prevent Russia from coming down to 26 miles in Alaska and setting down her ducks and using that whole area against us.

These are key points, key areas, in our cold war against communism. As Territories they are weak. As States they would be strong. Japan struck at both Territories in World War II. Hawaii and Alaska are prime targets under the American flag. Statehood would vastly strengthen America's position in the economic conflict now being waged by Russia throughout the Pacific. If we have any chance of survival on earth, the National Defense Committee of this body ought to know that here in Alaska and Hawaii is your vital area.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not now.

Since 1945 we have pushed billions of dollars over here in western Europe. We have neglected that area. We have let the Far East slide into oblivion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself seven additional minutes.

Nobody knows what we can do or what we are likely to do.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I think the distinguished gentleman has touched upon something that is the crux of this situation, and that is the strategic position that Alaska plays in this picture, from a military standpoint. My question is this: Is it the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that Alaska is of more benefit to us, from a military standpoint, as a State than it is now as a Territory?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Emphatically so. I have personally held hearings all over this Territory, in most every community of importance. I have studied the Territory and restudied it. I am not kidding about this situation. If it were within my power, I would make Alaska a State before the sun sets tonight. Those people up there are financially able to finance a budget for a State.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. You do not know about the banana belt down in this panhandle of Alaska.

Mr. COOLEY. I have been in the banana belt, if there is one there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the gentleman should not have made the statement he did about the rigorous climate in Alaska. There is a rigorous climate in Alaska, and there is one in Michigan, and there is one in North Dakota, but there is some very mild climate area in the Territory of Alaska, and that is where we ought to be settling; we ought to be homesteading there.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have been studying security problems for 8 years, and in my opinion the defense of States or Territories is a national problem, and a State government will have no effect on it whatever.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, wait a minute. The State of Michigan contributes to

national defense, and so does the State of Pennsylvania, and the State of California, and the State of New York, and of all men in this House who should be for statehood for Alaska, it is the delegation from California. Any man who has studied national defense ought to know that.

Mr. CANFIELD. First, I wish to compliment the gentleman for supporting the Republican national platform plank on statehood for Alaska.

Did not the late Billy Mitchell say that the nation that controlled Alaska by air controlled the world?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is no doubt about that at all.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested, in view of the extensive knowledge of the gentleman from Michigan with respect to this subject, for him to tell the House specifically why statehood for Alaska would better provide for the national defense than to have it operated as it is presently operating as a Territory.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me answer the gentleman categorically. At the present time this Alaska area is without a spokesman in the other body and is without a voting spokesman in this body. That is No. 1.

No. 2: This area, the Territory of Alaska, is under what we would term monopolistic control from the standpoint of transportation and communication.

No. 3: Until these barriers are removed, who with sagacious business judgment is going to put his private funds into this Alaskan territory to develop it in the absence of statehood? I say that because Mr. Harry Bridges and his gang can at any time they please, cut off the transportation of goods. As an illustration of the necessity for transportation let me repeat a conversation I had with a lady in Fairbanks. She was pushing a baby buggy with a child in it. I asked her what the baby buggy cost. She said it cost $29. That was the catalog price. "What was the freight?" She answered: "$39." Who wants to go to Alaska other than those who have an extreme desire for adventure? Why? Because there is no representation in the House and in the Senate that can vote to defend these people against the present monopolistic powers that are primarily oppressing this area. I refer particularly to the commercial fisheries and the big ship operators. They have a very specific interest in opposing this bill.

Why did we convert our western territory into States? Because we wanted to give them strength, to unite them, and to obtain the benefits which flow from ties of transportation, communication, manufacture of goods, the production of raw primary goods, and the movement and trade of those goods in between. Why have a United States? Why did you now discuss a United States of Europe? Why did you just discuss and sanction a United States of Indonesia? Why do you want to tie them together? You want to tie them together for strength. Anybody who ever studied the old McGuffey's Reader and Speller ought to know that if you take six boys, or six States, or six sticks and tie them together, you strengthen all.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Who owns and operates the Alaska Railroad at the present time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Alaska Railroad does not run from Seattle to Alaska.

Mr. COOLEY. I asked who owns it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It runs within Alaska, and it is no good unless material comes from the south to carry over it. The United States owns it, of course.

Mr. COOLEY. And operates it now?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why, sure.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the Interior Department?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. COOLEY. If we should turn that railroad over to Alaska now they could not run it for 24 hours.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly, because what they need up there is highways and air transportation to get to the land.

Mr. COOLEY. And the gentleman says they do not need any railroad?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The railroad would be an imposition upon them if they had to finance it. I have discussed this with people all over Alaska. The railroad is a strictly national defense asset and must be financed by the Federal Government.

Mr. COOLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that we do not need it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As one interested in national defense the gentleman should know the paramount need of the Alaskan people is for air and highway transportation. The railroad is for national benefit and defense.

Mr. COOLEY. It is being operated by the Government of the United States at the present time, but the gentleman advocates its abandonment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do nothing of the kind.

Mr. COOLEY. Those were the gentleman's words.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I advocate nothing of the kind, not at all; the gentleman is not going to put those words in my mouth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, this is an important piece of legislation; in my opinion, it is the most important single piece of legislation that has come before the House at this session. This measure is unlike other bills. If we make an error in passing the ordinary type of bill we can correct the error; we can amend it, or we can repeal it. But we are entering now into a contractual relationship between the Territory of Alaska and the United States of America, and it is binding. Someone brought up the point a while ago about one of our Western States that has approximately 90,000 people and it is a part of the Union. There is no way I know of, whereby we could, even if we wanted to, change that status.

Before we go further we must be sure of the steps we are taking. Coming from the great State of New York, I cannot consent to watering down the voting representation of the people of that State. Alaska has approximately 90,000 people. When we speak of admission of Alaska we have a double package. If we admit Alaska, we must also admit the Hawaiian Islands. There will be four additional United States Senators, not two, but four, additional United States Senators.

Just to get down to figures for a moment, we in New York State have approximately 16,000,000 people. Alaska has 90,000, which means that in the United States Senate, the people in Alaska will have nearly 200 times as much representation as the people who come from my district and every other district in the great State of New York. Speaking of my own congressional district, the Alaskans will have four times the representation in this House as the people who reside in my district.

Mr. JOHNSON. The ratio in New York is 273.9. In other words, one voter in Alaska will have 273.9 times as much power as the individual voter in the gentleman's district.

Mr. DELANEY. I thank the gentleman. If we admit Alaska, we admit Hawaii. We must admit also every other Territory or every other possession that we have which seeks admission. We have Puerto Rico in the Caribbean area. Upon application we must admit Puerto Rico. We also have the Virgin Islands and the very committee which reports this bill has asked that they have a Representative sit here in the Congress with the same rights as every Member except the right to vote.

I say if you admit Alaska the people in the Virgin Islands just as much citizens of the United States as those people who are in Alaska and upon application and qualification must be admitted to statehood.

What is the test? The test has never been population, wealth, or the number of people. It has merely been the ability of the applicant area to govern itself. I think it has been demonstrated to us that the people of the Virgin Islands are capable of governing themselves. In the 1940 census the people of those islands numbered just a few less than 25,000. Do you realize how disproportionate the representation would then be?

There is one State—Texas—that made a reservation 105 years ago. When Texas came into the Union it reserved the right to itself to divide into four additional States. I say if this representation is as disproportionate as it would be under the circumstances of admitting these various areas into the Union, Texas would assert its rights and divide into five States. We would have North Texas, South Texas, Central Texas, East and West Texas. Texas would have 10 Members in the Senate instead of the 2 it now has.

Mr. Chairman, I say in all sincerity this is something we must at this time guard against.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Upon what ground does the gentleman make the statement that the Virgin Islands can apply for statehood or that Puerto Rico can apply for statehood?

Mr. DELANEY. There is no restriction under article IV of the Constitution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not talking about article IV of the Constitution.

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman asked me a question. I will answer him.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am talking about the fact that the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska were incorporated into the Union. The gentleman knows good and well those other two areas were not so incorporated.

Mr. DELANEY. That is not necessary. You can come into this Union without that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I ask the gentleman to submit a brief and put it in the RECORD, and if he is correct, I will make an apology. I have studied this question for 15 years, going on 16, on this one committee, and I defy the gentleman to sustain his argument.

Mr. DELANEY. I would advise the gentleman to study the question just a little bit more and maybe he will understand it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will take the word of the experts who have lived with it down through the territorial history.

Mr. DELANEY. If the gentleman is desirous of obtaining information, let me read to him just what the Constitution of the United States says, and what the method is.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Go ahead and read it.

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman asked the question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Go ahead and read it. I am yielding the gentleman time.

Mr. DELANEY. Article IV, section 3, of the Constitution of the United States, provides:

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into the Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

Let me point out to the gentleman——

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes. Here is the proposition the gentleman lays down.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Michigan yielded to the gentleman from New York and took his seat, and he has no right to take the gentleman off his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan had expired, and he yielded himself two additional minutes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELANEY. I was recognized for two additional minutes for the purpose of being interrogated by the gentleman from Michigan; I therefore have the time. I yielded to the gentleman for a question and that question was answered, and I have the remainder of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The 2 minutes that the gentleman refers to have expired. The gentleman from Michigan yielded himself two additional minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States does have the power. The Congress of the United States exercised that power in making agreements between the Territory of Hawaii and the Territory of Alaska. The Congress did not exercise such power in connection with the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. I assume that the people of this country, acting through the Congress, have the power to take in the 20 republics to the south of us and make States out of them, if we desire to do so. I would assume that the Congress of the United States, through its people, by amendment to the Constitution or otherwise, could take in the 3,000,000 ocean mile area that now constitutes the trust territory delegated to this country by the trust agreement of the United Nations and take in all those islands as separate States if we desired to do so. I would assume that the Congress of the United States and its people, under our Constitution, could take in American Samoa and make it a State of the Union, and American Guam, and make it a State of the Union, and so on ad infinitum, and when the proposition is put before the Congress it will act on those things. But, why submit the specious argument here today that as the situation now stands, the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico could come in as States. Of course, that does not hold.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, according to the explanation made by the gentleman from Michigan, here is the situation. A long historic basis shows this, that when we contemplate statehood we first take them in as an incorporated Territory and then look forward to the time when they can live up to statehood. In Alaska that was done. It became an incorporated Territory.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us how many years that has been on trial and how many years Hawaii has been on trial building themselves up to the position of statehood?

Mr. PETERSON. They have been on trial since the admission of the Territory. Hawaii since 1900, Alaska since 1912. But, the promise was made prior to that time. The promise was implied in the treaty that they could get all of the rights of citizenship. Very shortly after that Mr. Seward went to Alaska and spoke to them and virtually promised them territoryship and statehood, and we have made a distinction between incorporated Territories and unincorporated Territories. Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Pico, and the other areas in their organic acts and some of the organic acts that are now being prepared are treated entirely differently. Hawaii came in by reason of a resolution which recited the ties between the United States and Hawaii. Hawaii was a sovereign nation, a republic, at that time. It was virtually the same procedure that was used with reference to the Republic of Texas. That is to show that historically we have treated them first as Territories and then as States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, much as I dislike to, I find myself in disagreement with the arguments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], but I subscribe wholeheartedly to the arguments advanced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I think that if we subscribe to the arguments advanced by the gentleman from New York we would disregard precedent and history. If our predecessors in this body had subscribed to such arguments, the western boundary of this great country of ours would not have extended beyond the Mississippi River. We must remember that many great States in the Union, stars represented in that blue field up there, would not have been admitted to the Union if we had subscribed to the kind of arguments made here a short time ago by the gentleman from New York.

Under the conditions laid down by the gentleman, my own great State of Illinois would not have been admitted to statehood back in 1818. I have read the debate in Congress on the question of admission of Illinois. The opponents talked then as the opponents of Alaska's statehood talk today. Fortunately their arguments did not prevail. You may say that in time Illinois would have been admitted anyway—but how can we be certain it would have. Had the opponents of statehood of the many States which have been admitted to the Union subsequent to the founding of our Nation by the original 13 been in majority we might well have a dozen or more independent nations where today we have one nation united. Our predecessors showed great wisdom in rejecting negative arguments in the cases of Illinois and the others and I predict the judgment of the House membership will be just as sound here this afternoon.

The granting of territorial status to Alaska more than 80 years ago carried with it a guaranty that someday this area would be admitted into the Union. Its people are entitled to full status of American citizenship. They must be

growing impatient in their present position as wards of the Nation. They cannot be expected to endure such a status much longer. They have served the necessary period of tutelage. We could not blame them if they became tired of being half citizens and demanded statehood or independence.

Now, in effect, they are living under circumstances strongly reminiscent of those which compelled our forefathers to revolt against British rule. Subject to all Federal taxes imposed generally, they have no right to express an effective voice in the making of the tax or other laws.

For these reasons I favor statehood for Alaska, but there is to me an even greater reason why I will vote to admit Alaska to the Union, and that is because the history of the United States shows that real development of an area has started only when Territorial status was changed to statehood.

Yes, and for selfish reasons as an American, I want this great Territory as a State of the Union. It abounds in untold natural resources. I want these preserved for the United States. You say we can preserve them as well by holding Alaska as a Territory. I refer you back to my previous remarks; people grow impatient as second-class citizens and they are prone to do something about it in time. It would be far better to grant statehood now than to ferment a condition that would lead to a demand for independence that could embarrass the United States in the family of nations. The Alaskans make no such threat—have not even advanced a hint in that direction—but we may very well be creating such a hazard by rejecting this measure today.

Since statehood will accelerate the development of the area, it is of the utmost importance from a military standpoint. Recently the commanding general of the Alaskan Department stated that military defense of Alaska could not be effective unless there is a growth in the civilian population and civilian industry. Statehood would aid materially in bringing this about.

Alaska has a population of about 100,000 today, exceeding the population of 12 States at the time of their admission into the Union. Few States can match her in resources. Her tremendous resources have barely been touched. Her timber, minerals, and her water power have not been tapped. All these things make her a necessary factor in the defense of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE].

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I have learned today that some of my colleagues believe that if one comes from a small population he may be a crook or unpatriotic; but that if he comes from the big, populous centers and the big States of the Union, that carry the big club, he is the only patriotic one. I am amazed.

Someone said there is one State in the Union that has 90,000 population. My colleague must refer, of course, to Nevada. I think in the 1940 census Nevada had a population of 105,000. We can expect, of course, that that will be greatly increased by the thousands by 1950.

If you had not admitted Nevada, what in the world would you have done over the past 100 years without the great wealth poured into this country out of Virginia City and all of the rest of the gold, silver, lead, zinc, and copper camps of that small-populated State of Nevada?

I happen to come from the small State of Utah. We had a population in 1940 of 500,000, I believe. I think we shall go to almost 1,000,000 in this next census. What would you do without all the copper that comes from the richest copper camp in the world, that is in the State of Utah?

I just do not like to find that because we belong to the smaller States and the smaller groups we cannot be patriotic. Who am I to say that the people who would be elected as Senators and Representatives from Alaska or Hawaii would not give us as good representation as I give and as any of you give?

I would be the last one to say Alaska would fail to send to this Congress qualified and patriotic delegates.

Alaska needs and wants statehood, but that is not the only reason for my support of the enabling legislation. Statehood for Alaska will be of immeasurable value to the United States as a whole.

Alaska's resources are tremendous, and as yet relatively undeveloped. The Territory's riches of furs, timber, fisheries, water-power potential, as well as gold and possibly oil, provide the States with a vast and much-needed reserve. New methods of processing and packing fish are being developed. There is a potentially enormous newsprint and paper supply, as well as lumber for construction purposes. Hydroelectric power has not been tapped. The soil and climate offer possibilities for experimentation with new fruits and vegetable species. It is essential that private enterprise be encouraged and enabled to develop these resources in the interests of the Nation, and it is a prerequisite to private investments that the settlement of the Territory be facilitated. Since the war, Alaska's population has rapidly increased, as ex-servicemen who found during their wartime tours of duty in Alaska that the Territory had much to offer, are returning there with their families. But it cannot be expected that the privileges enjoyed in the States will be lightly relinquished in exchange for the undoubted pioneer way of life in Alaska. It cannot be expected that the population of Alaska will reach its peak unless statehood is granted. There has frequently been advanced as an argument against statehood that there are not enough people in the Territory. The answer is that almost half of the States were permitted to enter the Union with smaller populations than Alaska has now. Moreover, experience has shown that very soon after admission into the Union, the populations of the former Territories increased rapidly. Alaska is our last frontier, and every possible encouragement must be given to its development. We must also consider the importance to the Nation of a strong Alaska, well-defended, and closely linked to the United States. The military and the Governor of Alaska have in recent weeks called our attention anew to the strategic importance of Alaska to our defense plans, citing the fact that Siberia may be viewed with the naked eye from Alaska, that Alaska was the only portion of the American Continent to be invaded during the last war, that it is the only part of the continent which reaches into the Eastern Hemisphere, and that its Pacific coast line is longer than that of the three Pacific coast States, and that it lies on the great circle route to the Orient. Because Alaska was not fully developed and well populated at the time of the last war, we spent for defense purposes alone about 25 times the amount originally paid for the Territory.

I therefore urge the enactment of enabling legislation for Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Utah has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentlewoman from Utah will agree with me in this statement that if these Territories became States, both Alaska and Hawaii could protect the interests of their citizens and their economic operations to a greater degree than they can now or were able to during the recent strangling strikes on both Territories.

Mrs. BOSONE. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do you also agree that statehood for these two areas is as important to the United States as it is to those Territories?

Mrs. BOSONE. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that these two Territories play a crucial role in our national destiny, in that they are our western bastions of defense, and that they represent to the peoples of Asia, the Orient, and the Pacific one example of unity and equality among free, great racial groups; whereas we are spending billions of dollars to convince the world that we are for the little people, these two Territories give a first-class example of Jeffersonian doctrine.

Mrs. BOSONE. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan entirely.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. How can we justify statehood for a few thousand of Alaskan people while denying the right of franchise to the hundreds of thousands in the District of Columbia?

Mrs. BOSONE. I believe the gentleman from Ohio has a point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Utah has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, those of us in the State of Washington have a particular kinship for the people of Alaska. My district happens to be in the northwest corner of the United States, the closest to Alaska, and the jumping-off point to Alaska. I know that the people of our area are vitally interested in statehood for the people of that great Territory.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the question of statehood for Alaska, I believe we should ask ourselves what the criteria for statehood have been or should be, and then see if Alaska meets the standard.

Is population a criterion? If it is, then Alaska certainly meets the standard. One-quarter of our 48 States had populations smaller than Alaska when admitted.

Is importance to the United States a factor? Alaska meets that test, too. It is not only of the highest military and strategic importance, but it contains valuable resources for which new uses and new demands are constantly being found. Statehood will, in my opinion, attract the people and the capital that are now the only missing factors in the full development and use of these resources.

Is desire for statehood a test? Then Alaska meets it. The people of the Territory formerly voted in favor of statehood 3 to 2, and a recent poll showed 68 percent of Alaskans desiring the change.

If political maturity is a factor, then there is ample evidence that Alaska qualifies as a State. Within the restrictions imposed upon it by the organic act, Alaska has enacted modern, progressive legislation, and in some cases has even led the United States. As the committee report points out, Alaska permitted its women to vote 6 years before we in America did.

The Territory has an active two-party system, as evidenced by the fact that in every Presidential election year Alaska has chosen, a few weeks before we held our elections here, a Delegate of the same party as the American President.

If a Territory should be required to serve some sort of apprenticeship before achieving full statehood, then Alaska has served its period longer than all but four of our own States.

The United States stands as a leader in the eyes of the world, striving to create the world over conditions under which peoples may guide their own destinies. Yet, the United States has denied to a politically mature people, prepared and anxious to make their own decision, the full right of self-government, and the right to a voice in the affairs of the Nation to which they are so closely tied.

I urge that we correct that situation. I hope, and I am sure that the House will vote, in favor of statehood for Alaska today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to try and bring to the members of the committee some information about Alaska. I have been on this committee for 8 years. I was a little astonished how the membership has changed since 1945 when the committee made a trip to Alaska to look over the territory. I find that only two Members who were on the committee at that time are still members of the committee today, the gentleman now addressing you, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAYLOR]. Even the present ranking majority and minority members of the committee today were not members in 1945. The change was brought about through the reorganization of Congress. So perhaps my few years of experience may warrant my taking a few minutes of your time to tell you some of the things learned by the committee that went to Alaska.

First let me say that at the proper time I propose to offer an amendment at page 6 of the bill, section 5 providing that if the Territory is admitted as a State they will have the opportunity of having more than four sections of land out of a township. The Federal Government now controls 98 percent of the land in Alaska. It is difficult to understand the thinking of the Interior Department. The first statehood bill introduced for Alaska, in 1945, proposed to give the new State two sections out of each township. A township is 36 sections. We finally got them to grant two additional sections, or four sections out of each township. I propose to offer an amendment which will give them every even-numbered section. I think this is necessary if we expect the new State to survive as a State.

How large is Alaska? Alaska is 586,400 square miles in area. Compared to the 3,022,387 square miles of the United States. Alaska is one-fifth the size of the United States.

Something has been said about the population of Alaska. The 1940 census of Alaska showed a population of 72,400. Our report made in 1945 estimated the population at about 80,000, of which some 45,000 was composed of native Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos; and about 55 percent white. I understand that the estimated population at the present time is 100,000. I presume it is growing and that it will continue to grow. But I want to point out that the Federal Government today controls 98 percent of the land in Alaska in the form of national parks, national forests, Indian reservations, and public domain.

Something was said about the plebiscite taken in Alaska for statehood. I have had a number of letters from people in Alaska. If in that plebiscite they had been asked "If you are given statehood would you expect to have two sections of land out of each township?" They would have said "No." If they had been asked: "How much do you think Alaska ought to have?" they would have said "At least one-half; we ought to have all of it, but at least one-half." I dare say that if you had placed on the ballot in the plebiscite that their coming in as a new State would be predicated on having only four sections out of each township that they would have rejected statehood because it would have been so unfair.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to rumors spread by the Foreign Affairs Committee that it was not the intention of the Government to defend Alaska I do not know if the State Department takes the same attitude about Alaska as they do about China and other areas of the world; but if they do they will act like an amoeba and start to pull away when the irritation comes. I do not know whether they are going to do that or not but I think it is worth exploring. Personally, I voted for statehood for Alaska. Sometimes I question whether the area of the State should embrace the whole Territory or that area where the population is heaviest and the land most usable, the southern and southeastern part of Alaska. But to go way over to the west, clear to the end of Alaska, and way up above the Arctic Circle and clear down to British Columbia we take in a tremendous extent of area. I am satisfied in my own mind that the new State cannot exist if we are only going to offer it four sections out of each township, then let the Interior Department control the rest of the land.

Our committee in 1945 found that the application of the statute on public land has proven burdensome, and I refer to the act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. 1128).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the section to which I have just referred reads as follows:

> The application of this statute has proven burdensome, Alaskans contended at the hearings, particularly in the southeastern portion. The Department of the Interior, it was charged, only infrequently granted waivers of the shore-space requirement, thus making settlement more difficult since choice settlement opportunities are often to be found along the water courses. Further, that the Department takes an unreasonably long time to process such share-space applications.
>
> The committee recognizes the basic importance of the policy underlying the act of March 3, 1903, namely, the preservation for general public use of the desirable shore areas suitable for wharves and like uses. However, to assume that whenever a settlement is made on the shore of a navigable water that a quarter mile of free space must separate it from the next settler, is to overlook the realities of Alaska. The committee urges the Department of the Interior to adopt a more liberal attitude, one based on the true values for shore-space purposes as intended by the policy of Congress, thus facilitating greatly the development of the Territory.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot get access to the water line in Alaska under this bill. The Department of the Interior will take the land for a quarter of a mile back. So that has held up the development of Alaska. If statehood would overcome that situation I would be for it, but I do not think it will. I think the Department of the Interior is holding too much land and the new State cannot exist with only four sections out of 36.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Irrespective of whether Alaska is a Territory or State.

it is our national duty to defend Alaska against attack?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. What would statehood add to that defense, if anything?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not know. The gentleman's opinion is as good as mine.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not think it would add anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I happen to have served on the Committee on the Territories for a number of years during my service here in the Congress. In fact, I was the ranking member on the Republican side at the time the Reorganization Act was put into effect, at which time the Committee on Territories was combined with the Committee on Public Lands.

During my service as a member of the committee I have had occasion to go to Alaska twice. We traveled extensively over the entire Territory. Coming as I do from the State of Oregon, which is very close to Alaska, outside of Washington the nearest point in continental United States, I have had during all of my life an opportunity to observe the great Territory of Alaska and also the Hawaiian Islands.

The people in my area believe very strongly that both Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands should be admitted into the Union as States. First of all, we believe it would be for the best interests of those two great communities to whom we pledged our word a long, long time ago that when they attained the population, the commercial activity and the other qualifications of statehood they would be admitted.

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, it would be in the best interests of the United States, certainly in these troublesome times when war is threatened. We only hop from one war to another. We have not got through with the last war. We have not signed the treaties ending the last war, yet we are preparing for another war at this time. We have $13,000,000,000 in the budget this year for another war. We spend three-quarters of the money in our Federal budget for war purposes—past wars, present wars, and future wars.

In the very next war we engage in, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii will be two of the most strategic places in the world for the defense of continental United States. I want to tell my good friends who come from the populous areas in these United States, great States like New York, if they want their territory defended, they should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish in national defense. They should look beyond their noses and realize that these great strategic areas in the Pacific are the very keystone to the defense of our Nation in the next world war.

When I was in Alaska the war was on. There great flights of planes were landing on Ladd Field, Alaska, coming in like flies, hundreds of them. Do you know where they were going? They were turned over to the Russians at Ladd Field. The Russians put their pilots in those planes—incidentally, these pilots could not speak English and I interviewed a number of them through an interpreter—and within a day or two those planes were on the battlefronts of Europe fighting in that great war. Thousands of our war planes went to those battlefronts to fly the Russian flag. If our planes can go from the United States to Russia, their planes can come over here. You must remember that the first place of attack in the next war would be on the Pacific coast, Alaska, California, Washington, and Oregon. You know that the Japanese in their war program contemplated taking that area, taking over all of the area up to the Continental Divide, and that we would never again, they hoped, be able to repossess the great States along the Pacific slope.

It is unwise to try to determine this question along State lines. Are we not all Americans? Are not the people, who live in Oregon or Nevada or Alaska Americans just the same as the citizens in New York, Illinois, and Indiana? Are we not all Americans? Are we not trying to do what is best for the country as a whole and not for any individual State? When you say that because a State is small it should not have the influence in the United States Senate that a larger State has in this great country of ours, the founding fathers settled that question when they adopted the Constitution. Let me call your attention to the fact, as I noted a moment ago, that Senator Borah came from the little State of Idaho, with only a few hundred thousand population, and he had, perhaps, greater influence in the Senate of the United States than any other man who sat there during his generation. His statue now adorns Statuary Hall. Only a few Senators have that distinction. There on the wall in this Chamber above the Speaker's desk you will see the remarks of Daniel Webster. Perhaps no man who ever sat in the United States Senate had such a commanding influence upon this great country of ours. He was the greatest statesman of his generation in the United States Senate. But, where did he come from? He came from the little State of New Hampshire. New Hampshire has only two Representatives today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. My good friends who now are arguing against the admission of these Territories because they are small would have denied Daniel Webster an opportunity to sit in the United States Senate. They would have denied the right to Senator Borah to sit in the United States Senate. Even our own Senator, Senator McNary, who was the head of our party in the Senate for many, many years, having served there for over 20 years, would not have been admitted into that great body.

My observation is from my travels over Alaska, and the experience I have gained by living in an area that is very close to Alaska, that in every respect, where we catalog the requirements for statehood, Alaska will meet the test, and that we should, not only in the interest of Alaska itself and the residents who happen to be living there at this time, but also for the best interests of the 48 States, this great country of ours, and particularly for the defense of this Nation, let us keep our word with Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands as well, and admit them into statehood.

As has been called to your attention here on the floor today, after statehood is once granted, the population will increase rapidly. Take my own little State of Oregon. We have increased 49 percent since the last war; a greater percentage of increase than any other State in the Union. The Pacific coast is now enjoying the greatest percentage of increase in population than any part of the United States. It is still true, westward the course of empire takes its way.

One of our colleagues just inquired whether by granting statehood to Alaska his State would lose a Member of Congress, and who would get it? Well, I will tell him who would get it. Oregon will get it, California will get, Washington will get it, other western States will get it where the population is moving, and that same answer applies to Alaska. The important fact is what is best for these American citizens and the United States as a whole.

My colleagues, let us not decide this question on the question of narrow partisanship or State lines. Let us decide it on the merits.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced in the Eightieth Congress H. R. 1808 which provides for the admission of the Territory of Alaska into the Union as a State on an equality with the other 48 States of the Union, and I have reintroduced the same bill in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 25. I will discuss briefly my purpose in sponsoring this legislation.

As I have already said as the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Territories in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I made trips through Alaska on two separate occasions, the first one in the summer of 1943. As a lone member of the committee, I covered a considerable portion of Alaska and traveled on a bus over the entire length of the Alaska Highway from Whitehorse to the southern terminus. The remainder of the road to Fairbanks at that time had not been completed.

In August of 1945 as a member of the subcommittee of the Territories Committee I had occasion again to visit the Territory, at which time the committee traversed much of the Territory by railroad, bus, and airplane supplemented by water transportation. We went as far north as Point Barrow on the Arctic Ocean, covering the Nome area on our return. We not only held hearings in the major cities we visited but we interviewed many Alaska citizens everywhere throughout our entire trip. On our return the hearings were transcribed and transmitted, together with a report, to the full Committee on Territories, for its consideration. It is now available for use by the Eighty-first Congress.

The purpose of the trip of the subcommittee to the Territory was to see for ourselves and to obtain on the ground first-hand information by the members of the committee the conditions existing in this great Territory and to discuss the problems facing it with Alaskan residents in order to acquaint the committee with the needs of the Territory and the legislation required to protect its interests, including the proposal for admission of Alaska into the Union as a State. The committee in concluding its report said:

> The committee is not in a position to make definite recommendations at this time on all the several matters which have been brought to its attention. Many of these proposals deserve careful thought and study. It is the spirit and desire of the committee to give careful attention and consideration to all proposals which have been presented to it, whether now in the form of specific legislative proposals or whether at the stage of discussion. We hope to work with the citizens of Alaska in a continuing effort to recommend and enact legislation which is in the best interests of the Territory and which will aid to open up and develop this great section of our country.

The committee did not make a specific recommendation on the question of statehood by reason of the fact that the citizens of Alaska at that time were contemplating holding a plebiscite to determine whether or not the majority of the residents of Alaska desired statehood. Since that time, as is well known, the vote has been taken and the statehood proposal was approved by a heavy majority.

On August 24, 1912, the Congress created the Territory of Alaska by an act which provided for the creation of a legislative assembly and defined its powers and duties. The organic act has had no major revision since its adoption. The fundamental powers granted the legislature were sharply restricted and are now outmoded and the Territory is hampered thereby in its desire to govern itself. The citizens of Alaska, including the Indians and Eskimos, are citizens of the United States and, of course, are subject to the duties and obligations of citizenship, including service in the armed forces and the payment of Federal income taxes. The Territory is not permitted to participate in the making of the Federal laws which govern it nor in the determination of taxes which its citizens have to pay. It is a striking example of taxation without representation. Furthermore the major portion of the land area of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government, aggregating 98 percent of the total of 586,400 square miles. These federally owned lands consist of national parks, national forests, Indian reservations and public domain. Restrictive laws and regulations governing these federally owned lands are such that it is difficult for residents of Alaska to obtain title to land within the Territory which, to a large extent, has hampered the development of the Territory. If the Territory were admitted into the Union as a State it should and no doubt would receive parity treatment with other States of the Union and these restrictions which have hampered its development and growth would be removed. Under statehood the old organic act which is outmoded and ineffective would give way to a modern constitution and State laws of Alaska's own making.

Alaska is the last great frontier remaining in the United States for settlement and development. Its vast area, reaching from the mild climate of its southern coastal areas to the frozen northlands of the Arctic contain great natural resources capable of development and use. First of all, the fishing industry of Alaska is one of the great resources and has added many millions of dollars to the economy of our Nation, providing it with food products of inestimable value. It is true the Territory itself has not profited to the full extent possible from this valuable industry by reason of outside controls and imported labor and withdrawal of the fishery products and cash returns therefrom from the Territory.

Forestry is an Alaskan asset of large value. There are vast stretches of timbered areas, particularly in the southern portion, which are awaiting use. Much of this is suitable for commercial saw timber. Extensive portions are valuable for pulp for the manufacture of paper, an adequate supply of which is coming to be a serious problem in continental United States.

Since the gold rush to Alaska in 1898 mining has continued to be one of the great enterprises of the Territory. Between 1880 and 1939 Alaska produced gold valued at $779,592,777, which is more than 108 times the purchase price of the Territory. Seward's folly has turned to gold. Gold, however, is accountable for only 81 percent of the mineral production. There are many known coal deposits in Alaska, but only two are commercially developed fields, which are located along the Alaska Railroad. There is reason to believe that there are extensive oil deposits underlying Alaska. Extensive development has already taken place in adjacent Canadian oil fields. Our own Government is now actively engaged in tapping these deposits in Alaska, and the outcome is most promising. The mining industry will continue to be through the years a major one in this great frontier land. Alaska, from the days of Russian control, has been the source of much of our fur supply, and it continues to be a heavy producer of furs of great economic value to Alaska.

Our committee was particularly interested in the development of agriculture in the Territory. Many of our people do not appreciate that many portions of Alaska are especially adapted to agricultural use. Much has been written about the Matanuska project developed by the Federal Government. While it is true that excessive sums of Federal money were expended, if not squandered, in the development of this project, it is also true that it has demonstrated the fact that the lands in the Matanuska Valley will produce exceptionally fine crops and when properly managed will successfully support many families. This valley lies at the head of Cooks Inlet. The winters are comparatively mild, the climate being influenced by the warm waters of the Pacific Ocean, and it enjoys a heavy rainfall. Hardy vegetables thrive in the area. Grass suitable for grazing abounds and the dairy industry is carried on extensively. Fortunately there is a heavy demand and ready market for all agricultural products raised in the Territory and in spite of the agricultural developments in the Territory large shipments from the outside are required to meet local demands. Agricultural development is also carried on extensively in other parts of Alaska. The University of Alaska at Fairbanks maintains two agricultural experimental farms which are performing a real service in determining the kind and type of agricultural products and animal industry suitable for the various areas of the Territory.

The great hinterland extending back from the mild southern coast line over the great interior plateaus and mountain ranges and across McKinley National Park and on to the Arctic Ocean, makes Alaska indeed a land of wonders. An asset of great value to the Territory is its tourist possibilities. It is a hunter's and tourist's paradise. The grandeur of its scenery and the beauty of its coastal areas on the inside passage are unsurpassed. Alaska abounds with large game, Kodiak, grizzly and polar bear, mountain sheep and goats, reindeer, moose and caribou, and will continue to be the mecca for sportsmen and other tourists who are interested in the wildlife of our country.

The greatest need in Alaska is adequate transportation facilities. Its development has been held back by lack of adequate low-priced transportation to continental United States, as well as transportation within its borders. Before the war it could only be reached by air or water. No land transportation was available and air transportation was crude. As a war project the great Alaska highway was forged through the wilderness some 1,600 miles, terminating in Fairbanks. While the major portion of this highway lies in Canadian territory and has now been turned back to the Canadian Government, it has demonstrated the fact that an adequate highway can be maintained, giving Alaska land transportation to the outside world. As the Territory develops under statehood in the years that lie ahead, this great artery should be improved and maintained with lateral extensions as a permanent land transportation system servicing this great north country.

The war further demonstrated the need of permanent first-class air service connecting the United States via Alaska with Asia, Europe, and the Far East. The great circle route from our mainland via Alaska is the shortest and most serviceable skyway to the Old World. The 9,000 war planes we delivered to Russia at Ladd Field, Alaska, to fly this route to the battlefields of Europe and Asia, demonstrated the worth of the great circle approach via Alaska to the Old World. If these sky engines of death can fly from the United States, others can fly back to the United States the same way. Alaska may no longer be the back door but the front door to America. Alaska may be the Pearl Harbor of world war III. It is only a few hours flying time from our mainland and is within bombing range

of Tokyo and Vladivostok as well as other European and Asiatic centers. Perishable air cargo now leaves Portland, Oreg., in midafternoon, arriving in Anchorage about midnight. Alaska holds the key to the national defense of the United States mainland in the event of a third world war. Our air and land defenses in Alaska should be made impregnable. Immense sums have been expanded by our Government during the war in charting airways and building airfields and air facilities throughout the Territory and there should be no slackening of our efforts to develop and maintain Alaskan air facilities to full strength not alone for peacetime use but for our national security.

The welfare and development of Alaska requires that the whole transportation field receive early attention to the end that this strategic area of our Nation will be provided with adequate transportation by land, water, and air. Such transportation service should not only be adequate to its needs but should be reasonable in cost so as to obviate the high charges now being exacted in every field of transportation to and within the Territory, a bottleneck impeding the development of Alaska.

Alaska has one railroad, Government-owned and operated, leading from the coast into Fairbanks. The rates are excessively high. It is old and worn out through age and excessive use during the war servicing Ladd Field at Fairbanks. It should be rehabilitated and restored to full effectiveness not alone for local services in Alaska but as a part of the program to keep Alaska impregnable for national security. The highway system in Alaska should also be extended and improved to permit its full development. Alaska needs settlers and it can only secure settlers by having adequate highways and other transportation to enable its settlers to reach markets. New settlers bring new industries. Statehood will afford the people of Alaska the opportunity to solve these and many other problems in the American way by local State government.

The schools of Alaska are maintained in part by the Federal Government and in part by the Territory. If statehood were granted, the whole school problem could be revamped and coordinated under local State control so as to provide an integrated school system, providing adequate education for all the children within the Territory.

Proponents of statehood for Alaska realize that it will involve increased local taxation. Self-government means State budgets which must be met out of taxes. However, with the citizens of Alaska in control of their own affairs they will be in a position to meet this problem by practicing strict economy in government operations and capturing tax funds from all of its citizens and from all of the industries and commercial operations in Alaska. The tax load may in this manner be equalized and spread fairly upon those who should bear the burdens of government.

The people of Alaska have now maintained a territorial government for 36 years, and the period of pupilage should be ended. Alaska has grown up and should discard its knee pants. Territorial government has outlived its usefulness. Alaska has developed an economy with ample resources justifying statehood; its citizenship has advanced socially and educationally in keeping with the standards of continental United States. The residents of the Territory have voted by a large majority in favor of statehood, and the best interests of the Territory and its people, as well as the welfare of the United States itself, require that statehood be granted.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the bill (H. R. 331) receive the support of this Congress so that the Territory of Alaska may be admitted to full statehood in our Union of States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support to the pending measure providing for the entry of Alaska into the Union. I do that because I am quite sure that the people of my great State of Minnesota would want me to do just that. I can remind you that among other reasons I have in mind for supporting this bill is this: A few years ago several hundred citizens of the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota formed a colony and moved up into the Matanuska Valley of Alaska as an experiment to find security on new land. Most of them have remained there and are slowly succeeding. I am sure those people in their communications to the folks back home have asked for this very bill we are considering today.

The thing that irks me most in this debate this afternoon is the question raised by some Members of this House as to how many civil-service employees or Government employees are involved up there. What difference does that make? I think the civil-service employees and the Government employees are beginning to find themselves in a state of serfdom, because everywhere the bars are being drawn against their rights as free American citizens and to exercise their franchise of government. The first question asked here today is, How many Government employees are up there? I have found Government employees to be very loyal citizens of this country and very good judges of those whom they want to select as their Representatives.

Another question that comes up here is the question of the number of Members of Congress there shall be. Four hundred thirty-five. By granting to Alaska statehood we may have to take in one or two more Members. I find plenty of seats here and I have not yet realized that we were operating a closed shop here as against any further membership in this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am conscious that from present indications there is a strong possibility that this House will vote statehood for Alaska. If such favorable action is taken it will in my opinion be largely due to the fine personality of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. His manner is always charming, his attitude friendly and his ability of a high order. Recognizing as I do these personal elements it is difficult for me to vote against this bill. However, I believe it is my duty to give consideration to the subject, divorced from the personalities involved, and consider it from the standpoint of national welfare and necessity. As I do so, I am unable to agree with the proponents of the measure that it is either necessary or will promote our national welfare at this time. Consequently, I will vote against the bill.

There are many reasons that bring me to the conclusion I have reached. Uppermost is the fact that giving statehood to Alaska will enable it to have two United States Senators for a voting population of approximately 20,000 voters, a population that is far less than any State of the Union. This would give to a territory thousands of miles away, with an exceedingly small population, the same voting strength in the United States Senate that New York and many other populous States with millions of voters in each, including our own State of New Jersey, now have. This is my opinion, especially if Hawaii and Puerto Rico should hereafter be recognized and thereby obtain two Senators each, is an undue representation for the number of people involved.

Furthermore it is reported that the total assessed value of property subject to taxation in all of Alaska amounts to only $110,000,000. This in my judgment is not sufficient to produce sufficient tax revenue to sustain a State government and the local governments necessary to carry out the responsibilities and obligations of statehood.

It is difficult to understand why the administration leaders should press at this time for representation for the people of Alaska, and, at the same time ignore the hundreds of thousands of citizens residing in the District of Columbia. The latter are without any direct representation in either House or Senate. They do not even have the right to cast their votes for President of the United States. It seems to me that this presents a case where justice should commence nearer home.

An argument has been made for statehood for Alaska on the theory that it is a very strategic area from a military standpoint. I agree that it is but it does not require statehood to strengthen our security in that respect. This security has and will continue to be a national obligation. The strategic character of this territory has and will continue to be recognized by our military forces. They have and will continue to make our defenses in that area impregnable against foreign attacks against the United States by way of Alaska. There is nothing that statehood could provide any more than has been done in the past with Alaska a Territory of the United States.

The people of Alaska have no basis of complaint against the treatment it has had as a Territory. Congress has always been ready and willing to give every

consideration to its needs, and provide the facilities that would promote the welfare of its people. It has been my privilege as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to assist in the passage of legislation that would promote the transportation facilities of the Territory, both land and air, advance its health, and in all other ways that come within the jurisdiction of our committee. The same can be said with reference to all the other committees of the House and Senate, and, both bodies have ever been ready and willing to pass all such legislation, and the President to approve the same.

For these and many other reasons I cannot see my way clear to vote for the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking minority member of the committee for giving me this extra time.

Mr. Chairman, I have grave doubts as to whether or not Alaska is at the present time capable of handling statehood. They have an assessed value of all private property of only $110,000,000. With the tremendous extent of their territory, I doubt if that is enough of a tax base on which to raise enough revenue to run a State government with all the ramifications and different things it has to do. My home city of Stockton, Calif., which approaches 100,000 in population now, has an assessable base of only $80,000,000, and it has a very difficult time running that town with that assessable tax base.

I do not want anybody that listens to me to think I have anything against the people of Alaska or against the small States or against States with small populations. I just believe that Alaska today is not ready for statehood. It does not have a sufficient population to handle the situation.

With reference to the national defense, statehood would not make one single contribution to national defense. That is a Federal responsibility exclusively. We all look to the National Government for our defense and security. I am on the border of the country in California, where we could be attacked. We look to the National Government to take care of our national-defense problems, although we furnish great numbers of National Guard troops and Reserves. When war comes they are promptly federalized.

Concerning population increases, we cannot be sure that the population will increase, so we had better wait until Alaska has the requisite population. If they had a half million people I would be the first one to help them get statehood, but they have only between 95,000 and 105,000 population, and that is not adequate at this time.

Capital will be attracted to Alaska if it gives investments a chance. Statehood would not help that one bit. The opportunities are there and the resources are there. If it is attractive enough, capital will go into Alaska. It will not go into Alaska simply because the people have statehood. Everybody knows that. Another thing, the plebiscite showed that only 3 out of 5 voters went for statehood in a vote of 16,384 people who voted on the question. I doubt as a matter of morals or fairness whether we should force upon 40 percent of the population of Alaska statehood, which they do not now want. I believe ultimately Alaska should have statehood when she has demonstrated that she can handle it and that she has the population to warrant statehood and can take care of the responsibilities that come with statehood. This she does not now have.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, because I believe that the admission of these two Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, into the Union is a part of the historical westward movement of our star of empire, I favor this measure. I have a practical reason for favoring it, also. I recognize the strategic place that these Territories occupy as has already been pointed out. The Pacific Ocean from now on will be the ocean of commerce and of history to be written just as the Atlantic Ocean has been historically the ocean of commerce and great achievement. Alaska occupies a strategic place of increasing importance and for that reason she ought to have the dignity and standing of statehood.

Every phase of colonial policy may be found in the history of various colonizing peoples. Some good colonial policies may be cited and some unwise colonial policies might be given as illustrations. The United States of America—meaning the Old Thirteen as the mother country—has had a successful and wise colonial policy. Under that policy, the original 13 States have grown to a vast Nation of 48 States. In that process of growth, we have maintained strong ties of union and have written across this continent and throughout American history the phrase "E Pluribus Unum" which we see on the coin of the Nation and read on the ceiling above our heads. That is one of the most significant facts of American political history.

What was it in the policy of the original 13 States that has brought about this great and splendid result? It was our policy of encouragement, kindly consideration, and guaranty of equality to the children who have moved into the West—into an ever-expanding West—to build new commonwealths, establishing there the institutions which they brought with them from the older States. This encouragement helped to settle the West, built up its new States, and cemented those new communities to the older communities into an indissoluble Union. As we look back over the past, we are grateful that the founders of the Nation took a wise and unselfish view of the West and provided in the basic law that "new States may be admitted to this Union on terms of equality." Thirty-five States have thus far been added to the original 13 and forged into one strong Nation because of that wise policy. The admission of Alaska and Hawaii will, in my judgment, be a carrying out of that policy.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MILES].

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of statehood for Alaska, believing it to be in the best interests of the welfare of the Nation. I sincerely trust the bill passes.

Mr. Chairman, recently, upon my return from an extended tour of the Pacific Ocean area, I joined with my colleagues of a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Lands in recommending immediate statehood for Hawaii. A bill to enable Hawaii to become a State, H. R. 49, had already been favorably reported by the full committee, and on January 23 the House agreed to its consideration.

Statehood for Hawaii is not new. It was not dreamed up yesterday.

Statehood for Hawaii goes back 100 years into the history of our Republic and its earliest interest in the Pacific.

The need for tying Hawaii to the United States was first advocated in the Congress of the United States in 1852. In that year, a Democratic Congressman from the State of California demanded that the Hawaiian Islands be annexed on the ground that they were necessary for the protection of California and the Pacific coast and essential in carrying on American trade with Asia and the Pacific islands. The Whigs, the then opposition party, were opposed to further expansion and did not look with favor on annexation proposals in general. The expansion question went to the people in the 1852 national elections.

In the fall of 1852, a Democrat, Franklin Pierce, was elected President of the United States. In his inauguration address, President Pierce declared that his administration would not be controlled by "any timid forebodings of evil from expansion."

In 1853 President Pierce appointed a new United States Commissioner to the Kingdom of Hawaii, David L. Gregg of Illinois. The first instructions to Commissioner Gregg pointed out the increased importance of Hawaii to the United States because of the acquisition of California and the Oregon Territory and the developments in eastern Asia which was then being opened to trade. Mr. Gregg's first instructions contained nothing on annexation.

On his arrival in Hawaii, however, Mr. Gregg found annexation to be the subject of the day and no little source of trouble in the community. The official representatives of the Governments of France and Great Britain in Hawaii were busy doing everything in their power to stem the proannexation tide. In a sharply worded note, the King of Hawaii was advised that—

> Any attempt to annex the Sandwich Islands to any foreign power whatever, would be in contravention of existing treaties, and could not be looked upon with indifference by either the British or the French Government.

The American Commissioner, when informed of this action by his British and French counterparts in Hawaii, re-

minded the King that the United States, unlike Britain and France, has so far not made any attempts on the independence and sovereignty of the islands and that none was now intended. He pointed out, however, that it was not surprising that Hawaii's people, especially the merchants and landed proprietors, should see the great commercial and other advantages to be derived from union with the United States. In an unveiled reference to the evils of colonialism, he pointedly advised the King of Hawaii that "the Government of the United States can have no colonies" and that "whatever territory is added is an integral part of the whole, and subject to the same national constitution and laws."

The British and French Ministers in Washington, acting under instructions from their home governments, made representations to the Secretary of State. Secretary of State Marcy politely informed the British, and through them the French, that the United States had the same desire as the British and the French in regard to the continued independence of the Hawaiian Islands. He pointed out, however, that if independence became impractical and the Hawaiian Government might be in danger of falling into other hands, it was highly probable that the United States would be disposed to admit the Hawaiian Islands to the Union. The Secretary of State made it plain that the United States would resist strenuously any attempt by any other power to obtain possession of the islands.

The United States, although fully cognizant of the value of the Hawaiian Islands to American security and commerce in the Pacific, nevertheless did not press for annexation. It was not until after the Hawaiian King, faced with trouble and revolution, had ordered his Minister of Foreign Relations to ascertain the views of the United States in relation to annexation, that the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands received serious consideration by our Government.

In May 1854 our Commissioner in Hawaii requested and received instructions from the Secretary of State to open discussions with representatives of the King on the matter of annexation. Three months later, on August 7, 1854, the American Commissioner to the Kingdom of Hawaii advised the Secretary of State:

I have succeeded in arranging the terms of a treaty of annexation with the Minister of Foreign Relations, which meets the approval of the crown prince and cabinet. But it is not yet signed, and I am unable to give you assurance that it will be immediately completed. * * *

The great difficulty I had to encounter was the inveterate prejudice of the Hawaiian authorities against a territorial form of government, which could not be overcome. Finding it impossible to provide otherwise, I finally consented to agree to the admission of the islands as a State, as soon as it could be done in conformity with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, leaving the laws, so far as they are republican and consistent with such Constitution, in full force and effect in the meantime.

Article II of the treaty which was finally agreed upon on August 19, 1854, in Hawaii, provides as follows:

The Kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American Union as a State, enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such as soon as can be done in consistency with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, to all rights, privileges, and immunities of a State as aforesaid, on a perfect equality with the other States of the Union.

I cite this incident of history to show that statehood for Hawaii is not new. It goes back 100 years to the earliest days of organized government in Hawaii and to the very infancy of our own Republic.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico in order that I may ask him a question.

The distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, who was formerly Governor of New Mexico, is chairman of the subcommittee which recently conducted hearings extending over a period of about 6 or 7 weeks throughout the Southwest Pacific, including the trust territories. I wish to ask the gentleman this question, for the benefit of the Members: In all of the contacts that the gentleman made in the Hawaiian Islands, in American Samoa, the trust territory, American Guam, the Philippines, and in conference with our officials and Chinese officials in Hong Kong, and in conference with the general staff in Tokyo, including conferences with General MacArthur, and all the points between Tokyo back to San Francisco, did the gentleman from New Mexico get the distinct impression from the standpoint of national defense and from the standpoint of the defense of our international relationships and of opposing the Russian philosophy that the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska should be granted statehood at this time?

Mr. MILES. Yes, I did.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I have listened to all these "Me, too" endorsements to this proposal. I listened to the remarks of the gentlewoman which I thought ought to be stricken from the record because I know that nobody feels that way concerning the citizenship of the American people who live in Alaska. I would like somebody to explain this "me, too" business. What benefits will they enjoy more than they are enjoying today, other than having two Senators and Representatives in the House? We have not kept anything from them, have we?

Mr. MARSHALL. If the gentleman will permit me, I will attempt to answer some of these things in part. It seems to me, after listening to the debate that some Members are concerned as to what we, ourselves, might be giving up in our own particular districts if we grant statehood to Alaska so that Alaska can have representation in both bodies of the Congress.

I want to point out to the Members of the House that my State will be giving up a distinction, if Alaska comes into the Union as a sister State. We are now the most northern State in the United States. When Alaska comes into the Union we will be giving up that particular distinction.

Our State came into the Union in 1858. The Territory of Alaska has great resources, more known resources than our State had at that time. The Territory of Alaska has more people than our State had at that time. The Territory of Alaska is closer to Washington than Minnesota was at that time.

The gentleman has asked me what benefits would accrue to Alaska by coming into the United States. One of the things that we are doing is to provide for a unified country. We are providing for citizenship that will put their shoulders to the wheel and become a part of this great Nation. As a matter of defense, the figures of history show that no country is stronger than their civilian population in time of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan very much.

The people of France are more guilty of the failure of France in the last war than the armies of France were. The people of Alaska will put up resistance in Alaska to invasion, as a matter of national defense, when they can feel that they are a part of this great country.

We are talking about the development of the country. I am sure most of the Members of this House are believers in the fact that local subdivisions have a greater knowledge of their problems than we do here in Washington. This will put in their hands the means whereby they can develop their country to a greater extent than we can hope to do from here.

Now, we were talking about Government bureaus awhile ago. We have some very fine Government people. They are shifted around. It is natural that they are. The people in Alaska, in setting up their government, provide a stable government. They provide a government whereby they will have their representative and that they will have a way of coming to Washington.

Right here I would like to pay a compliment to the Delegate from Alaska. He is an excellent gentleman. It has been a pleasure to know him and to work with him. I would like to see him, when he sits in that chair, have a right to cast his vote the same as any other individual Member of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, over the years the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and I have almost always voted the same way.

It just breaks my heart to desert him at this particular time.

We all have our hobbies, and we all have our foolish moments. I get up sometimes in the morning at 3 o'clock and come back at 8 o'clock, just to go up the river and throw a little chunk of lead and a little piece of bright metal tied on a line into the river to see if some fish is foolish enough to hit it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] said he had traveled up and down across and all over Alaska. With all due respect, I would make the same remark about him that my good wife makes about me: "You are just nuts about fishing." Now he may be just nuts about this Territory stuff. He is very excited about it and very enthusiastic about it. I cannot understand why, though I know he is a great sugar man. Hawaii is a sugar territory. He has always been, as I have been, an isolationist. Now he wants to take in Alaska and Hawaii. He has been against United Nations; is he now for One World? We are pledged by the Republican platform to make Puerto Rico a State. The next thing he will want the Virgin Islands and possibly Guam made States. That will give us 10 additional Senators from the 5 new States. Those 5 new States, comparatively speaking, will have 10 Senators out of 106, or one-tenth of the voting strength of the Senate. That ratio would be all out of proportion if we consider the population of the other States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to take seriously distinguished gentlemen who take this floor and advocate statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. In listening to them I wonder whether I am a simpleton or just being taken for one.

The fundamental objection, Mr. Chairman, to the admission of Alaska or any of the other like possessions to statehood is that they are not contiguous territory. Alaska and Hawaii have been tied together. To admit one means to admit the other, which means the ultimate admission of every island in the world over which the American flag flies.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that if there is a strictly controlled Communist community in any part of the world, it is Hawaii. Harry Bridges holds the whole island in the palm of his hand, and the admission of Hawaii would mean the admission of a Communist State, and the putting of two followers of Stalin in the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] such time as he may require, to the extent of the time left at my disposal, to answer the statement just made by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Hawaii is recognized for 17 minutes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by the gentleman from Georgia is completely and absolutely false. The record of the people of Hawaii during World War II, the record of our own Government, the record of the last election, the record of the last legislature, and particularly the special session which was called to save the people of Hawaii in that crisis when you here refused to do anything, is the complete answer to the gentleman's statement. I want to say to you that the welfare of this country is in just as safe hands when it is in the hands of the people of Hawaii as it is when it is in the hands of the people of Georgia, and I think in many respects their regard for the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is a lot more serious and more effective than is that of the people of Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to participate in the debate on the question of whether Alaska should be admitted to the Union as a State, but I do want you to know that I am sincerely in favor of it. I know that the vote on this question is going to have a vital and important bearing on whether we admit Hawaii into the Union as a State. I recognize that many of the arguments that have been made against Alaska will be made against Hawaii.

The gentlemen from the large States say to you that if you admit Hawaii and Alaska into the Union we will each have 2 Members in the United States Senate. Now, Alaska and Hawaii did not ask for 2 Members in the United States Senate. That is determined by the form of government under which we live. You know from reading your American history that that determination was made by the founders of this country. Those gentlemen, particularly the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California, have not told you that New York has 10 percent of the membership of this House, some 45 Members, and that California has some 23. That is the complete and final answer to that.

Let me point out to you also that in this country today there are 13 States with 2 or less Representatives in the House—7 of the Mountain States, 2 Middle Western States, North and South Dakota, and 4 Eastern States—Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Delaware. We are in approximately the same category as those people. If it is wrong to give Alaska and Hawaii representation on the basis of area or as a particular community, why do you not cut down their representation or why do you not increase the representation of New York, California, and those States in the Senate of the United States?

You cannot measure the importance of this problem in terms of the East or the Middle West or the West alone. You have to look at it from the standpoint of its influence on the people of the Pacific. I regret it is impossible for me to charter the Lurline and take the whole membership of the House to Hawaii tomorrow because I know if it were possible for me to do that 90 percent of the membership would come back roaring in favor of the admission of Hawaii into the Union. We have done it repeatedly, and even the gentleman from New York, who participated in the inquiry under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE], came back with the committee and recommended immediate consideration for statehood for Hawaii. Is not that true?

Mr. DELANEY. I did not recommend that Hawaii be admitted, merely that this body have an opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Of course, the gentleman did. He saw it was a question that was going to have to be settled.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Have there not been many times during recent months that the people of Hawaii have felt that they were absolutely forsaken by the President of the United States and the American Congress and the people on the mainland.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I may say that the people of Hawaii have a wholesome respect for the right to vote. If we had a vote for President, if we had voting representation in the United States Senate and voting representation in the House, we would many, many times be better off. I do not know anyone in this House who would trade his status as the Representative of a State for that of a representative of a Territory.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman referred to the opposition that was heard from California and New York State. I do not think the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] had any intention of expressing the sentiment of the whole California delegation, and I do not think he did. As a matter of fact, I want the gentleman from Hawaii to know that I am supporting admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. I think that is true of other Members of the California delegation. I wish the gentleman would clarify the point when he mentions California.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am aware of that, and I am delighted to know that the Representative from Stockton does not speak for the rest of the State.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman pointed out words to this effect: In granting statehood to these Territories "we will be assuming some new obligations with these people coming back on us." Will the gentleman tell this body the contribution the Territory of Hawaii makes to the Federal Treasury?

Mr. FARRINGTON. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have been paying the same taxes that the people of the States have been paying since 1900. On June 30, 1940, they had paid a total of more than $1,000,000,000 into the Federal Treasury. Hawaii normally pays more than 10 or 15 States into the Federal Treasury, and we make no complaint about it. On a per capita basis our payments run higher than do that of something like 30 or 36 States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the whole eco-

nomic fabric of Hawaii from A to Z is just as sound as the economic fabric of the United States, and anybody who will study the question should be willing to admit it.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. When Hawaii became a part of the Union, it was an independent republic, was it not?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And we had a general agreement with them, when they came under our flag, that as soon as they became sufficiently identified with our institutions we would make them a State of this Union.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is absolutely right, and I am glad the gentleman pointed that out, because that is at the core of this whole argument. We have been led to believe for years that when we met the qualification for statehood, we would be given statehood. Now, all of these islands that you talk about in all parts of the world are not in that status. They have got to be integrated into the country first; possibly given a period of tutelage as a Territory. We are not voting for that at the present time. We are voting on the question whether two Territories, promised statehood by implication, at least, should be taken into the Union at this time. In the face of the situation that confronts us in the Pacific today, how can we follow any course other than that recommended by the gentleman from Michigan, to integrate all parts of our country as tightly as possibly by admitting Alaska and Hawaii to the Union as States.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Obviously, a Territory that has over 535,000 people is entirely in a different status than a community of only 100,000 people. You have 10 times the assessable property in Hawaii that you have in Alaska.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Let me say that my opinion is that as soon as Alaska is released from the shackles of Territorial government it will begin to prosper and its population will begin to increase. That is the point of this whole thing. We want to open up this area, this great empire, to American enterprise. How can you Republicans justify your opposition to this, in the face of your attacks on bureaucracy? We are not taking anything away from the States; we are trying to take something onto ourselves.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the Delegate yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I do not know a finer man in the House of Representatives, and I do not think that I have enjoyed the company of a finer man than the Delegate from Hawaii. I likewise think the same of the Delegate from Alaska. The gentleman just made a statement that interests me. By opening up and becoming a State, take Alaska, for instance, just what does that do toward developing it? Do you not have the same privileges, other than voting that the States have? Do you not have the same benefits that we prescribe to the States with respect to roads and with respect to other Federal aid? Do they not enjoy that now?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to have the Delegate from Alaska answer that question, because that applies particularly to his Territory.

Mr. BONNER. I had the pleasure of being in Hawaii with the Delegate from Hawaii. They are grand, fine people there. But, it really personally hurts me to feel as I do about taking Hawaii in as a State, and I want this to go into the RECORD to show my position and my feeling toward the Delegate from Hawaii, whom I greatly admire.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, if the Delegate will yield, I would like to say to the gentleman from North Carolina it is precisely because we do not have the same benefits as the people in the States, by reason of acts of omission and commission, that the people outside have. We think statehood is the only answer. For instance, we are not under the Federal Highway Aid Act.

Mr. BONNER. Wait a minute. We spent a tremendous amount of money when I was on the Roads Committee of the House appropriating money to build the Alcan Highway.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was a war measure, together with a great many other military appurtenances that were built during the war. But, I am talking year in and year out. The only highway aid acts extended to Alaska are those that apply to the national forests. Public domain roads are built under the auspices of the Department of the Interior. Uniformly through the years we had only maintenance money. We are receiving somewhat more money now, merely because of military needs.

Mr. BONNER. Do we not apply it in public works funds, road construction? Do not the same divisions apply in Alaska as would apply to the States?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; they do not.

Mr. BONNER. Just what is the difference?

Mr. BARTLETT. The acts simply do not apply to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I dare say that many previous Congresses have heard the same arguments when other Territories were being considered for admission into the Union. I should like to speak today in behalf of the admission of Alaska, because, coming from the Northwest, we have close ties with the Territory, and we are well aware of the problems which confront the people of that area. I do not want to see the citizens of Alaska or Hawaii continue to occupy a second-rate status. I want to see them become full-fledged American citizens and have all the rights and privileges and the representation the rest of us in the Union have. I want to see Alaska become a State, because then I think something definite will really be done about the defense of that huge territory.

If you will look at the map, you will see that it is possible on a clear day to look across the Bering Strait for 54 miles and see Siberia. If you will look at the map you will notice the close proximity of Little Diomede and Big Diomede Islands. You will see two islands owned respectively by this country and the U. S. S. R., less than 3 miles apart. If you think the U. S. S. R. is not looking into the Territory of Alaska, you are mistaken.

I think the best thing we could possibly do in our own national security would be to give Alaska statehood and full representation in the House and Senate, to the end that its defenses can be brought up to date and the security of this Nation become more secure as a result. The time to give Alaska a fair deal is now; the way to do it is to admit Alaska to the Union.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from the great State of New York, from this side of the aisle, I favor heartily the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

Mr. Chairman, all we are really doing is recognizing the modern effectiveness of the air age, which puts Hawaii and Alaska within reach of the eastern seaboard of the United States about as easily as the golden coast of California. We are just being modern in finally admitting these two Territories as States. The period of tutelage should now be ended for these two Territories, and they should be given an equality of status with the sister States of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the distinguished Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] went to the heart of all this when he said that if the kind of argument made here today against Alaska statehood had prevailed in the past our western border would be at the Mississippi. That is right, because every argument used here today against Alaska has been precisely the same kind of argument used against the Western Territories. Those arguments did not prevail. Those Territories became States. They prospered and they grew. I cannot prove to you that the population of those areas is greater now than it would have been under territorial status. I cannot prove to you that business is better in the West than it would have been if we had not admitted those areas as States. I cannot prove to you that industrial development there has been because of statehood.

But one thing is sure, and that is that those developments did come and that growth of population did come. I submit that was so because it is in harmony with the American genius of government to govern best when all local controls are applied that can be applied under our system of government. That was

done in the case of the West. The West has grown and prospered to the glory and benefit of the Union. Those benefits will accrue likewise if you admit Alaska as a State. Those benefits will accrue not only to Alaska, but to the entire Union.

It was said a while ago that there is doubt whether there is an intention to defend Alaska. I believe there is. I would say there had better be, because once these air fields in Alaska are seized by an enemy, the entire United States will be endangered.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman tell the Members of this body just how far it is by air from Fairbanks to Chicago?

Mr. BARTLETT. The distance, as I recall it, is just under 2,000 miles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And from Chicago to Washington is about 600 miles more, so that in effect from Fairbanks to Washington it is something in the vicinity of 2,600 or 2,700 miles, which is just nothing at all in this day and age.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct. Bombing planes from airfields in Alaska could reach any industrial point of consequence in the United States, bomb that city and return to the airport in Alaska.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am terribly concerned about the apparent failure of our Nation's peace efforts, and over what some people describe as the inevitability of war. I am concerned about our defenses in Alaska. I wonder if perchance the Delegate from Alaska has discussed the question of statehood with the top echelons of our defense establishments.

Has he perhaps some word from the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, on this very issue?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad that point has been raised. Yes, of course I have; most recently in a telephone conversation with Secretary Johnson. I asked him to express to me the attitude of the Department of National Defense on statehood. His reply, as well as I can recall it, was that the Department of National Defense stands squarely behind the administration's program with respect to statehood for Alaska.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Did anybody from the War Department come before the committee and give that as an official report?

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not rather strange that the committee did not call upon the National Defense arm of Government to give an opinion concerning a matter which now seems to be of very vital importance, so far as our national defense is concerned?

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I point out to the gentleman from North Carolina that the commander in chief of the armed services has come out for statehood for Alaska as well as both parties.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; and he has done so repeatedly.

Mr. COOLEY. Commander in Chief of what?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of the armed services—the President of the United States.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman will recall that in connection with the hearings on statehood for Hawaii my primary approach was on that very point, and they did so state, and it is shown in the record.

Mr. BARTLETT. In that connection I want to say that I had no knowledge whatsoever on the question of statehood for Hawaii until the hearings, and I must say that I was converted to that proposition within 15 minutes after Admiral Nimitz testified.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman was very easily converted, was he not?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, after Admiral Nimitz had spoken, I think anybody would have been.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman a question which I think is a fair one. Does not the gentleman believe that Members of Congress could make every single, solitary argument in favor of statehood for Puerto Rico that you can make in favor of statehood for Alaska?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course not, of course not.

Mr. COOLEY. What argument can be made in favor of statehood for Alaska that cannot be made for Puerto Rico?

Mr. PETERSON. But the organic act is different.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to call to the attention of the House a statement by Gen. H. H. Arnold:

> Upon Alaska our future may well rest. What, then, would be better, what would insure greater provision for our future than to recognize that most important area and make it a State equal to our other 48 States?

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. One of the most potent arguments that I have not heard raised in behalf of the gentleman's position ought to be presented in this RECORD. That is that this vast Territory of Alaska was purchased for about $7,200,000 in 1867, and that the claim was made by Mr. Molotov at the San Francisco Conference that that was a fraud perpetrated by the Czarist Government of Russia, and he indicated that the present authorities of Russia considered that that purchase, then made of Czarist Russia, would ultimately be attacked as being a fraud; and the argument is made by very sound people that the surest way to defeat any such contention would be to place Alaska squarely within the circle of the other 48 States.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am grateful to the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that I have had the privilege of visiting in Alaska. I found there a very patriotic people—just as patriotic as any people in the United States.

The thing that I want to bring to the attention of the House is this one fact: That today Alaska is the Achilles heel of our national-defense program. I think all will admit that. We have got warmongers running loose all over the world, including warmongers right here in our own Nation, who would like to see another war. The folks who are so opposed to making a State of Alaska will be mighty happy, if war comes, and God forbid, that the people of Alaska will hold the enemy off until we on the mainland can get a little better prepared. I am satisfied that sometime war is coming. It may not be for years and years, and I hope never; but, without doubt, it will come, and we on the mainland are going to thank God that the people of Alaska feel that they are well enough thought of by the people of the United States that they will fight to the last minute to keep the war away from the mainland.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say, in connection with national defense, that I cannot prove that national defense would be improved by statehood for Alaska, but I know it is the case. I could not prove that the one Representative and two Senators would vote for defense measures, but of course they would. This House should know that one postwar building season in Alaska was entirely lost because of lack of attention to these matters. The House should know that it was only in the closing hours of the last session that provision was made for military construction in Alaska. If we had two voting Senators and one voting Representative in this House, certainly the defense picture would have been materially changed.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am in favor of this bill. I went to Alaska on a mission some months ago. My cousin had the privilege of being the delegate from Alaska for many years. I believe Alaska will make one of the outstanding States of the Nation.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in the history of Alaska, already long, this is a day which will be remembered. We Alaskans now and for the first time are given opportunity to seek our rightful place in the Union to which we owe allegiance through birth and conviction.

Alaska statehood aspirations are not new. They reach back through the years, but never before has there been opportunity for this House to pass upon the granting of statehood. It is a proposition not only of local but of national sig-

nificance. As such, it has deserved and has received, I know, your closest attention and most earnest consideration. The other day I addressed a letter to each Member of the House in forwarding a pamphlet giving information about statehood for Alaska. In that letter I was so bold as to state that I cannot believe there is any objection to statehood of sufficient merit to influence any Member of this House to vote against statehood. That statement was made out of a profound belief that it constitutes no more or no less than the simple truth.

Alaska comes before this House today seeking statehood under the same terms and the same conditions which applied to the western territories entering the Union before us. We ask for no special favors.

Give us statehood, and we will give you—and before long—a mighty State whose population will grow constantly, whose business and industry will develop in harmony with the resources upon which they will be based. And those resources, I do not have to remind you, constitute a vital addition to the real wealth of this country.

If in its wisdom the House today should reject this bill—something I do not for one moment believe will occur—Alaska will struggle on, will continue to exist as an American Territory in one fashion or another. But let me say here, and emphatically, that it will remain dormant and the great day of awakening will only be again postponed.

If, on the other hand, the House today should pass H. R. 331 and the other body should act similarly, the road will have been cleared of the windfalls which now block it and at long last Alaska will be able to shift to high gear.

We Alaska statehood advocates do not try to represent to you or to anyone else that statehood would be a cure-all. Certainly we do not maintain that under statehood all vexing problems would immediately disappear and that all would be sweetness and light. No, indeed. We realize that there would be difficulties ahead, as there have been in every new State—and perhaps in some of the older States as well. But we do submit that statehood would help more than any other one thing and, above all other things, would enable us to take our rightful place under the American system of government. We do not so assert merely out of a hopeful belief and without evidence to support our view. We call upon American history for confirmation. That history shows that almost uniformly progress of all types reached a certain point under Territorial status and then stopped almost completely. Under the stimulus of statehood the existing impediments were removed and development came. There is no reason whatsoever why that should not be so in the case of Alaska. In fact, the record tends to indicate that the handcuffs which were placed on Alaska, governmentally speaking, were locked much tighter than in the case of other Territories. And the opening of those handcuffs, which can only be brought about by statehood, ought to, and in fact would, enable the pioneer hands of those in Alaska now and those who will go there to carve a mighty new State for this Union from our last western frontier.

Next month—on March 30 to be exact—it will be 83 years since the treaty of purchase of Alaska from Russia was concluded. It is significant to note that in a speech ratifying the treaty, Senator Charles Sumner specifically dedicated Alaska to future statehood in the Union.

I have said that Alaska, above all other Territories in the history of the United States, has been hampered by the type of government it has suffered from rather than enjoyed. Let the record speak:

Purchase from Russia was made in 1867.

Seventeen years passed before there was any legal government whatsoever.

At one time the might and power and dignity of the United States in Alaska was represented in the person of a Treasury Department official who was supplied with a rowboat to visit different sections of the district, none of which could be reached by means other than water.

Sixteen more years were to elapse before Congress enacted a code of laws applicable to the Territory.

It was not until 1906 that the people of Alaska were permitted to send a Delegate to Congress.

Six additional years were to pass before the organic act became effective. Judge Wickersham—then Delegate Wickersham—was the author of the organic act. When it was finally signed by President Taft in August of 1912 he was far from satisfied with the results of his authorship. For the bill, in its progress through the two Houses of Congress, had been so cruelly mauled, so savagely set upon that it had become merely a caricature of what was intended to be a document of home rule grants to a Territory of the United States of America.

Believe me, these omissions with respect to granting Alaska the rights which should have been hers as a Territory, plus some very deliberate commissions, have joined to make it almost incredibly difficult for the American citizens there to fashion a real homeland, American style. If there is one principle we are all ready to agree upon it is that American democracy thrives only under a situation where local government is given every last grant of self-rule constitutionally permissible—but in Alaska that rule has been uniformly violated. We have been set upon by the very Government to which we hold allegiance, and we have been fair prey for predatory interests against whom we had no proper protection.

So discouraged was Delegate Wickersham with the organic act which was taken from his hands in clay so soft that it had been broken and shattered on its subsequent journey that he immediately realized that it would not suffice.

His conclusions on this issue, after some preliminary and fruitless attempts to secure correction, resulted in his introducing the first statehood bill in the Congress of the United States in March 1916. That was not the date marking the first statehood aspirations within Alaska, but it was the date those aspirations first had formal expression.

The laments of Alaskans, always fighting against discriminations imposed upon them, were long ago given expression by a rhymester when he wrote:

Sitting on my coldest glacier, with my feet in Bering Sea,
I am thinking cold and lonely, of the way you've treated me.
Three and thirty years of silence! Through ten thousand sleeping nights
I've been praying for your coming, for the dawn of civil rights.
When you took me, young and trusting, from the growling Russian bear,
Loud you swore before the Nation I should have the Eagle's care.
Never yet has wing of Eagle cast a shadow on my peaks,
But I've watched the flight of buzzards, and I've felt their busy beaks.

The 10,000 nights referred to in the rhyme have now become almost 30,000 nights. We are still waiting. Our long vigil will be over if H. R. 331 should pass this House now and should be accepted by the other body.

We have been often told in the past—we are told now—Why don't you wait with your statehood plea until you are really ready for statehood? Why don't you let the Federal Government do things for you which you need before attempting to support a State government? You need many things. We will give them to you and then it will be time to ask for statehood.

There was a time when we used to go along with that theory. There was a time, we believed, that if we only waited all good things would come to pass. We were rather naive in that belief because the record was quite clear and showed conclusively that it was all a dream of a never-never land that was not to be.

To do part of the job, it would have been necessary for the Federal Government to have liberalized existing legislation relating to Alaska. It would have been necessary to allow Alaskans to have more and more local autonomy. That has never been done. There has not been one major amendment to the organic act since 1912 in the direction of increased home rule. Every Delegate in Congress since then, Republican and Democrat alike, has sought to enlarge in necessary ways, the boundaries of self-rule, but uniformly without success. Even comparatively minor amendments have been difficult to secure. A first-class illustration of this is to be found in the organic act's language relating to taxing powers vested in the Territorial government. The organic act provided that tax assessments shall be according to the actual value thereof. Largely as a consequence of that language, no general property-tax law was enacted by the Territorial legislature until last year. That was principally because the mind of man was not agile enough to devise a means whereby all the huge acreage of mining land in Alaska could be assessed at its actual value. In 1948—36 years after the organic act became law—the Congress passed a revisionary bill permitting the Territorial legislature to tax mining

land at a flat value per acre. If 36 years is required for amendment of that character, how long will be needed for a real home-rule amendment?

Another example: Back in 1899, before there was any Territorial government, the Congress empowered clerks of the district court in Alaska to collect certain taxes from business enterprises. That was done simply because there were no Territorial officials to collect what were, in effect, local taxes. The money so raised was deposited in the Treasury of the United States and annually appropriated by Congress, according to a percentage formula, for roads, schools, and care of the indigent. Obviously, this temporary expedient should have been abandoned with the establishment of the Territorial government in 1913. After all, these were purely local taxes which were being collected, and a judicial officer such as a clerk of the court should scarcely have been burdened with tax-collecting duties, nor should the judges of the district court have been required to pass upon indigent claims. One would believe it would be simple, indeed, to change this. But it was not. Even with reference to such a small matter, one regarding which there was very little controversy, it was not until 1949 that the law was changed.

Alaska, with its 586,000 square miles, has at this time less than 3,000 miles of roads. Alaska has never been under any of the Federal Highway Aid Acts except those pertaining to roads within national forest. The vast public domain is almost without roads.

Until recently, practically nothing was done in the way of agricultural experimentation to match that which is proceeding across Bering Strait in Soviet Asia. Let me admit—freely and gratefully—that now and for several years past, the appropriations for and in behalf of Alaska have been substantial as compared with years gone by. In some categories—particularly for defense—they have been too small. But judged against the past, they have been almost astronomical. However—and this must be underlined—they are being made solely because of national defense requirements and are, in my opinion at least, altogether unrelated to what might be termed normal development of the area.

You should know, if you already do not have the information that in Alaska the Federal Government, in ordinary times, has adopted a policy certainly not in harmony with a sound development program. Up until the time the war started, Federal expenditures in Alaska were in the aggregate so small as to serve no useful purpose whatsoever in creating industry and expanding population. The services performed by the National Government were by way of being on a caretaker basis. The aggregate expenditure in the Territory each year was not enormously larger than the amount produced from Alaska each year in income taxes. Obviously, a frontier land can never develop under such a policy. And Alaska did not develop. The stimulus which now is being felt there comes about admittedly by reason of the substantially larger expenditures which are being made on account of the world situation. It is probably safe to say that 95 cents out of each Federal dollar spent in Alaska now is, if not directly for military purposes, so closely related as to be part and parcel of the general plan. Of course, this has brought people into Alaska. Of course, it has caused business to expand. Of course, it has started some industrial development, even if on a very small scale. But—and this is of vital importance—if the need for making defense expenditures were to end tomorrow, would there be any more hope of securing development funds for Alaska than there was in years gone by? He who would answer that question in the affirmative would be a brave soul, indeed, and his reply would run counter to the experience of history and the practices of men. If Alaska were to remain under territorial status it would return once more to the seat of central government in a beggar's role and in beggar's clothes. In such a state it would remain as neglect and indifference reasserted themselves.

It was because Alaskans, who have long studied all of these things, realized they could never obtain true home rule as a Territory and could never hope for needed Federal appropriations as a matter of right that the move for statehood crystallized in the early part of the last decade. That movement found as its leader a man whose name will always occupy a shining chapter in Alaska history—Anthony J. Dimond, then Delegate in Congress and now a judge of the District Court in Alaska. It was he who started anew the long fight to achieve for Alaska the status of a State and it was around him that informed and growing public opinion lodged. It has expanded mightily since then. In 1946 the first statehood referendum was conducted, and statehood was endorsed.

So, Alaskans want statehood. They have so said in a democratic way through the casting of secret ballots. They have thereby asserted their willingness to pay whatever increased taxes statehood might demand. They are willing to do so for the benefits which would accrue to them and thus to Alaska through the possession of sovereign rights now denied them.

Another question then arises: Even if Alaskans want statehood, even if they are ready to assume its obligations and responsibilities along with its benefits, would the Nation enjoy benefits equal to those of Alaska, or are there objections from the national viewpoint so serious that the demands from the Territory should be ignored? First, let us examine the situation from the purely materialistic point of view. No one would be prepared to say in 1950 that the United States made any mistake whatsoever in purchasing Alaska. It has proved to be an exceedingly good bargain. The price paid to Russia was $7,200,000. Since then, natural resources valued at approximately $3,000,000,000 have been shipped from Alaska to the United States as increments to the national wealth of this country. And those who are not impressed by the number of residents in Alaska cannot say that Alaskans have not been good customers. Since 1867 they have purchased from the United States proper goods valued in excess of $2,000,000,000. If we Alaskans under State government could manage our own affairs as do the people of the several States, we can—again relying upon historical records which prove what happened in similar instances in other places—look forward to a notable gain in this two-way and mutually profitable trade. Give us the key—and that key is statehood—to unlock our treasures, and we shall make this rich and great country of ours even richer and greater. Objections can never be made to Alaska's claim to statehood on the basis that it is a land without resources, of barren Arctic wastes. Three-fourths of the Territory lies in the Temperate Zone. It has the last great timber stands in the United States. It has land suitable for agriculture and for grazing. It has mineral deposits, already discovered and potential, of unknown worth. It has hydroelectric possibilities which American industry will have to resort to. It has all these things and more. It has that which is needed to make a prosperous State of the Union.

But it is noncontiguous. That has been cited as a reason for not granting statehood. It is said, and correctly, that no border of Alaska touches upon any State. When Louisiana was admitted, it likewise was noncontiguous. It was 210 miles from Louisiana to Tennessee, the nearest State. And when California was admitted, the next State was Texas, 470 miles distant. The airplane of today, flying at 250 or 300 miles an hour, covers the distance from any point in Alaska to Washington, D. C., in a mere fraction of the time it was required to go from Louisiana or California to the closest State by then existing means of transportation at the time they were admitted. So noncontiguity certainly cannot be claimed to be valid with respect to Alaska if it were not considered valid in earlier times in our history. If it had so been considered, Louisiana and California would never have been admitted when they were. The argument then for contiguity was infinitely stronger and more persuasive than it ought to be in 1950 when man's ingenuity and inventive skill have shattered distance.

It has been said that if Alaska and Hawaii were to become States now the bars would be taken down and the way would be paved for statehood for Puerto Rico, Guam, and, in fact, all the islands of the sea. This contention is singularly lacking in merit. So far as Alaska is concerned, the answer is that in adopting the Organic Act of 1912—deficient though it may be—the Congress then and there evaluated the political future of Alaska and determined that after serving an appropriate period in school it should receive its diploma and become a full-fledged State. Hawaii was likewise singled out for future statehood. Both Alaska and Hawaii are organized Territories. As such, they are integral parts of the Union. They have been incorporated. That is to say, long ago their future status was passed upon and the decision made. Not so with respect to the unincorporated territory of Puerto Rico and to Guam and other possessions. The

act of incorporation means that the Territory becomes an integral part of the Union. That, Puerto Rico is not at this time. Nor is any area except Alaska and Hawaii. So we do not establish any precedent with these two Territories. We merely move to carry out a policy which in the case of Alaska was expressed in 1912, the date of incorporation.

There is additional evidence on this score. Even before Congress acted, the Supreme Court had found Alaska to be a part of the United States. This is set forth in that very admirable volume, Alaska Under Rule of the United States, by Jeannette Paddock Nichols:

In the first place, the legal status of Alaska among the noncontiguous possessions of the United States had been finally settled by the Supreme Court in 1905. Since 1900 that body had been delivering a series of opinions, popularly termed the "insular cases," which developed certain distinctions as between the legal status of Hawaii and of the possessions acquired from Spain (Puerto Rico and the Philippines) and that of the older Territories on the continent, Alaska, Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico. The new possessions were declared to be unincorporated Territories, appurtenant to, and dependencies of, the United States, but not a part of the United States; in legislating for them Congress was declared to be bound only by the fundamental parts of the Constitution which automatically extend to all Territories of the United States as soon as they cease to be foreign territories: The formal portions of the Constitution, on the other hand, were to apply to them only when Congress so directed. The older Territories were declared to be incorporated Territories; in legislating for them Congress was bound by all the limitations in the Constitution which were not clearly inapplicable. In this connection the Supreme Court reserved the right to determine from time to time what parts of the Constitution are fundamental and what formal: and in the latter class were placed, one after another, provisions involving the interpretation of the term "United States" in reference to uniformity in taxation, clauses concerned with citizenship, and the requirements of the sixth amendment to the Constitution regarding the use of grand and petit juries in the prosecution of crime.

In every Alaska case the Court placed that region in the class of incorporated Territories. For example, although taxes imposed in Puerto Rico need not be uniform with those imposed throughout the United States (decision of May 27, 1901, in *Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S., 244) those imposed in Alaska must share in that uniformity. For by a decision of May 31, 1904, in *Binns* v. *United States* (194 U. S., 486) the Supreme Court decided that although the rule of uniformity of taxes applied to Alaska, license fees imposed on certain lines of business by the Alaska penal code must be deemed local taxes, imposed under the plenary power of Congress over the Territories, for the purpose of defraying the expense of the territorial government. And again, although the provisions of the sixth amendment did not apply to Hawaii or the Philippines (decisions of June 1, 1903, and May 31, 1904) in the cases of *Hawaii* v. *Mankichi* (190 U. S., 197) and *Dorr* v. *United States* (195 U. S., 138) they did apply to Alaska. For, by a decision of April 10, 1905, in *Rasmussen* v. *United States* (197 U. S., 516) the Supreme Court declared that section 171 of the Alaska Code (31 Stat. L., 358) insofar as it provided that in trials for misdemeanors six persons should constitute a legal jury, was unconstitutional and void, under the fifth and sixth amendments.

The reasons for these differences in classification were given by the Supreme Court, as follows: The treaty with Russia, concerning Alaska, instead of exhibiting, as did that with Spain concerning the Philippine Islands, the determination to reserve the question of the status of the acquired Territory for ulterior action by Congress, manifested a contrary intention to admit the inhabitants of the ceded Territory to the enjoyment of citizenship, and expressed the purpose to incorporate the Territory into the United States. Therefore, under the treaty with Russia ceding Alaska and the subsequent legislation of Congress, Alaska had been incorporated into the United States and the Constitution was applicable to her.

These decisions gave Alaska the proud title of Territory in the place of the name of district with which she had been burdened since 1884; and they took her, though a noncontiguous area, out of her association with the dependencies acquired from the Spanish War, into a class again peculiar to herself. Like Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, she was to bear thhe name of Territory and bask in the effulgence of the Constitution; but unlike them, she yet remained destitute of delegate and local legislature.

So, it becomes apparent that to act affirmatively with reference to the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills would not be to open the statehood gate to any other area anywhere.

There is another argument which has been urged against Alaska statehood. It is said that 100,000 people ought not to have the same voice in the Senate of the United States as the people of such great and populous States as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California. I can give no more effective answer to this than by quoting the Chicago Journal of Commerce, which editorially commented upon the opposition of the City Club of Chicago to statehood, because of Senate representation. Said the Chicago Journal of Commerce:

In view of the existing disparity proportional representation in the Senate is already precluded. It was never intended by the founding fathers. Way back in 1790, for example, Virginia, with a population of 747,610, was granted the same senatorial representation as Delaware with 59,096, and Tennessee with 35,691. It is the House, not the Senate, which is intended as the Chamber with proportional representation.

Alaska's population has now passed 92,000. That of Nevada is 174,000. New York's is 14,393,000. Both numerically and percentagewise, the gap between the State of New York and Nevada is many times greater than between the State of Nevada and the Territory of Alaska.

The potential population of Alaska is considerable. It boasts of more than a half million square miles, rich with timber, furs, and gold. Its fisheries and canning industries are extremely important. With the increase in air transport, Alaska will move ever closer to the present 48 States, in hours and economic ties.

Certain well-entrenched business interests also oppose Alaska statehood. They're doing nicely right now, thank you, and they don't want things changed. But, from the standpoint of over-all economic welfare and of common justice, Alaska (and Hawaii) statehood should be conferred by Congress. And the sooner the better.

Frankly, I think the debate on this issue comes a bit too late to be used against Alaska. As the Journal of Commerce says, proportional representation in the Senate is not possible under the Constitution. If it is desired to amend the Constitution, that is something else again. But no one to my knowledge has seriously urged it. In view of what has happened in the United States in the last 160 years, one is entitled to suggest that the founding fathers did not do too badly in setting up our governmental structure. It would seem that some rather praiseworthy accomplishments have occurred under that Government, and that lack of proportional representation in the Senate of the United States has never been detrimental to the best interests of our Nation.

That is an old, old story. It is discussed and debated and worried over almost every time a new State is created. Oklahoma is the only State which came into the Union in recent history with a rather sizable population. It had around one and one-half million people upon admission. Hawaii is the only other Territory having a substantial population before gaining statehood.

It might be contended that the only tried and true means of increasing population in a Territory is to grant statehood. That could be said, for example, in the case of Illinois itself. If those who represented the more populous States in that day took the same attitude the city club of Chicago does now, surely statehood would not have come to Illinois when it did. Illinois at the time of admission had 53,211 people. Some historians suggest the census takers at that moment were unusually active and to swell the figures to the greatest possible extent counted in those immigrants who were merely passing through Illinois for the West. Virginia then had 1,065,366 citizens, Pennsylvania 1,049,458, and New York 1,372,812. So it might be suggested that a considerable disparity existed between the population of Illinois and all of the other great States named. Notwithstanding, Illinois was admitted, and he would be a hazardous soul, indeed, who would claim now that that action was unwise. The population of California today ranks it as one of the greatest of the States. But it was not so in 1850 when California first came into the Union as a State. Then each of its citizens, through having two Senators, had what the proponents of proportional representation in the upper body would describe as a voice out of all proportion to their numbers. California then had 92,527 residents. But Virginia's population was 1,421,661, Pennsylvania's 2,311,786, and New York's 3,097,394. Even so, with two Senators representing only 92,527 people from California, the Union maintained itself. Oregon's population was only 52,465 when it achieved statehood in 1859. By that time Virginia's population had increased to 1,596,318, Pennsylvania's to 2,906,215, and New York's to 3,880,735. But Oregon's plea for admission was just; Oregon was admitted, and Oregon has become a substantial and a great State of these United States. So it goes. The argument of population lack ought not to be used against Alaska now. If ours was the first Territory numerically inferior, then it would be different. Instead, in that respect we occupy not a unique position but one that is, in fact, massive with tradition and in conformity with the experiences of our past. Here again the

question might be asked, "What comes first, the chicken or the egg?" Generally speaking, history demonstrates in conclusive fashion that the granting of statehood itself is the one great and significant act which makes for growth and population.

In asking you to pass H. R. 331, the Alaskans who are for statehood desire to remind you that their Territory with a population of 100,000—an increase of 39 percent over the 1940 population—at this time has more citizens than did 16 previous territories. They were Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Florida, California, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, and Wyoming.

If proportional representation would have prevailed in the Senate, it certainly would have prevailed when our Government was founded, when the Thirteen Original States joined to organize the Union. There were wide disparities in population even then. Virginia had 747,610 people as against only 68,825 for Rhode Island and only 59,094 for Delaware. Pennsylvania with 434,373 people was given the same voice in the Senate as New Hampshire with 141,885.

It was away back in 1905 when in debating admission of Oklahoma Senator Bate quoted President Washington as having written:

> Among the privileges, benefits and advantages thus secured to the inhabitants of the territory south of the river Ohio appears to be the right of forming a permanent constitution and state government and of admission as a state by its delegates into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the original states in all respects whatever, when it should have therein 60,000 free inhabitants, provided the constitution and government so to be formed shall be Republican and in conformity with the principles contained in the articles of said ordinance.

Elaborating, Senator Bate added:

> That is, President Washington says that all that is necessary is to conform to the Ordinance of 1787 but he went further and recognized the right of forming a permanent constitution and admission into the union as something that must be done but being done gave to the people of the territory the right to be put on an equal footing with the original states in all respects whatsoever.

The question of statehood should not be settled upon a political basis. Politics should not be allowed to count in a decision in which national interests are involved. The platforms of both great political parties of this country have statehood planks.

At the moment Alaska happens to be Democratic. It has had a Democratic administration since 1932. From 1908 until 1932 it had Republican Delegates and Governors. It is not fixed in allegiance to any political party but maintains a healthy two-party system.

Advocates of Alaska statehood are certainly not confined to either party. For example, the Alaska Statehood Committee, created by action of the last Territorial legislature, has, as its chairman, Robert B. Atwood, prominent Republican and a newspaper publisher of Anchorage. The committee's secretary is Mrs. Mildred R. Hermann, a practicing attorney and a Republican of Juneau. Still another Republican member is the Reverend Percy Ipalook, an Eskimo from Wales in northwestern Alaska. A distinguished Democratic member is Frank Peratrovich, well-known businessman of Klawock and a member of the Territorial senate. An advisory member of the committee is Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, who, despite his presence on the Federal bench, remains an earnest and effective advocate of statehood. Still another advisory member is Alaska's Governor, Hon. Ernest Gruening. Appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, Governor Gruening is foremost in the ranks of the champions of statehood and very probably is one of the few men in the history of American Government who is doing his very best to talk himself out of a job by making it possible for Alaskans to elect their own Governor under statehood.

Other members of the Alaska Statehood Committee are: William L. Baker, editor and publisher of Ketchikan; Victor C. Rivers, Anchorage engineer and architect and a member of the Territorial senate; Stanley J. McCutcheon, Anchorage attorney, head of an air line and member of the Territorial house of representatives; Warren A. Taylor, Fairbanks attorney and member of the Territorial house of representatives; Andrew Nerland, member of the Territorial senate and a leading businessman of Fairbanks; Howard Lyng of Nome, member of the Territorial senate, and Lee Bettinger, mayor of Kodiak and a leading businessman there.

At this critical juncture of human events it might well be urged that even if Alaskans were entirely disinterested in statehood now, statehood should be granted them nonetheless for compelling national reasons having to do with security.

I have never heard a clearer exposition of why Alaska statehood should be granted for national reasons, as contrasted with local ones, than was given from the well of this House last Thursday by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He said what needed to be said on this subject when he declared:

> But why is it to our interest in the continental United States that statehood for Alaska be granted as soon as possible? Because only through statehood can Alaska be developed to the point that it can support economically the subsidiary measures of the defense mechanism which is necessary in this area for the protection of the whole United States. Only through statehood can Alaska develop the conditions necessary for sound logistics to supply our defense bastions.
>
> The saying that "in union there is strength" is not so trite as to be without meaning. The very nature of union is such that common advantage is derived. It would be a mistake for those of us here in the States to consider only the advantages we can give to Alaska out of our beneficence. There are mutual advantages to be gained, and not the least of these is that the security of Alaska, dependent largely on statehood, is vital to the security of the entire Nation.

The main Alaska coast at its closest point to Asia is less than 60 miles from Siberia. Little Diomede Island, under the American flag, is less than 3 miles from Soviet Big Diomede Island. No point in the world today is of more strategic significance than is Alaska. If Alaska had two United States Senators and a Representative in the Congress there would be a voting strength in behalf of adequate security measures for that region, and thus for the United States, that simply does not exist now. To build up Alaska so its population will increase, so that its business will expand, and so its industry will grow, will be to strengthen our defensive position. Then, and only then, will it be unnecessary for our armed forces to ship from the United States proper practically everything they need. There will be a local economy upon which they could depend to a greater extent and they no longer will be forced to exist in a sort of vacuum, as has unhappily been the case. Only a few days ago the Secretary of National Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson, said to me, when I queried him about statehood, that the Department of National Defense stands squarely behind the administration's program.

At other times in the past statehood has been granted primarily not because of local desires or needs but because the Nation's interests demanded such action. I submit that that is the case in Alaska now. I submit further that the case we in Alaska have made for statehood is compelling and ought to be accepted; but even if that were not so, our defense needs, insofar as they relate to Alaska, can be properly realized only with the granting of statehood.

The prospect of granting statehood to Alaska does not frighten the New York Times published in the biggest city in the biggest State, numerically, in the Union. On the contrary, the Times specifically endorsed Alaska and Hawaii statehood in an editorial which appeared in that newspaper last Sunday:

> FIFTY STATES
>
> The question of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood is due to come before the House again this week. A bill to give statehood to Hawaii passed the House in 1947, and ever since then there has been considerable talk, but no action. It seems to be indisputable that the bulk of the population of both territories wishes them to becomes States; the platforms of both major parties endorse the idea, differing only in degree of immediacy; and the historical development of the United States assuredly leads in this direction.
>
> Although Alaska's population is only about 100,000 (of whom approximately two-thirds were born in the United States), there are more people in the area today than there were in at least a dozen of the continental Territories at the time they became States of the Union. As for Hawaii, its 520,000 inhabitants are far more heterogeneous than those of Alaska; but even at that, almost 90 percent are American citizens, and the House report accompanying the statehood bill observes: "Certainly there is no area under United States jurisdiction where a greater complexity of races lives so harmoniously."
>
> The major objection in recent years to bringing either of these areas into the Union is the fact that they are not contiguous to the continental United States. Alaska is separated from this country by 870 miles of Canadian territory; Hawaii is 2,400 miles distant from the nearest point on the American mainland. This consideration would surely have been important in another era. But both Territories are less than 24 hours'

flight from New York today; and thus, they are actually far nearer in travel time than New York was to Boston when the Union was founded. With the annihilation of distance there has likewise been annihilated the argument, based on distance, against statehood for these two areas otherwise fully qualified to be integral parts of the Union.

Likewise, the Washington Post on February 28 endorsed Alaska statehood in a most persuasive editorial:

ALASKA'S CHANCE

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is at last scheduled for a vote in the House in two bills to be called up this week. This newspaper has commented several times on the eminent justification for bringing Hawaii into the Union; the case has in no way diminished. Alaska's petition seems to us equally justified. If anything, the importance of statehood of Alaska has been increased by the Territory's strategic position in the national defense.

Alaska's military significance is as an air base—for the United States or for an invading enemy. Let troops defending airfields there amount to only a corporal's guard. Although Congress has voted money for the military housing necessary to increase troop strength, it still has not appropriated funds for the vital radar-warning screen. Much of this neglect may be attributed to the fact that Alaska has only one nonvoting Delegate in Congress. The Territory is still thought of as a remote and icy wilderness instead of as the strategic prize it is.

If Alaska is to become a really stable bastion of defense, then it must be settled and developed. There is much reason to believe that absentee Federal direction has hindered rather than helped economic and population growth. For example, Alaska's fisheries have been dangerously depleted under Federal control. Also, Alaska's road development has been slow because she has not received help under the Federal Highway Aid Act.

Yet Alaska has continued to grow to the point where her population now exceeds 100,000. This is more than the population of 12 States at the time they entered the Union. Even considering Alaska's great area, her population per square mile is greater than that of such States as Nevada, Minnesota, and Oregon at the time they were admitted. Moreover, she is closely linked with the remainder of the United States by air and the Alaska highway. She has had 35 years' experience in self-government as a Territory. Her educational system is well established. The House Public Lands Committee, after broad investigation, has concluded that she should be able to support herself financially under statehood.

Alaska has been a United States possession for 83 years. During this period her tremendous resources—timber, minerals, power—and her great capacity for settling Americans in new homes have scarcely been tapped. On these grounds alone statehood for Alaska would be a wise and just investment. Much more than this, it has now become a necessary factor in the defense of the United States.

Today 100,000 Americans in Alaska await your verdict on H. R. 331. Our fate is in your hands. But it is not altogether alone our fate which you are considering. It is a fate which is intertwined with the welfare of the entire Nation.

The American citizens who live in Alaska come from every State in the Union. They seek justice at your hands. They are tired and weary of discrimination, hurt, and neglect. They do not think it proper for them to live under the American flag and to have all general laws, including those relating to taxes, apply to them without having any right to join in the making of those laws. They are weary of being stepchildren. They want to come home. They ask that you open the door to receive them so that they may live in this Union mansion of ours on terms of complete equality and trust.

They inform you through me that they, as America's last pioneers, need a new tool in the fashioning of the great northwestern peninsula. They need statehood.

They need it for their own sakes.

They need it for the children who will come after them.

They need it for the other Americans who will join them.

They need it so Alaska may be set up as a great defense bastion against any enemy from Asia.

They need it so all the people of the world may know that American democracy practices what it preaches, that it is positive, not negative.

They need it particularly so that the hundreds of millions who live in the area bordering the Pacific Ocean will be told as they could be in no other fashion that our form of government is dynamic, vigorous, and the best form of government yet devised by man.

Percentage of votes cast in 1948 election as compared with 1940 census—by States and Territories, votes for Senators and Delegates

State	Population 1940	Votes cast 1948	Percent
Colorado	1,123,296	510,121	45
Delaware	266,505	141,362	53
Georgia	3,123,723	362,504	12
Illinois	7,897,241	3,900,285	49
Maine	847,226	223,256	26
Massachusetts	4,316,721	2,055,798	48
Michigan	5,256,106	2,062,097	39
Minnesota	2,792,300	1,220,250	44
Mississippi	2,183,796	151,478	7
Montana	559,456	221,003	40
New Jersey	4,160,165	1,869,882	45
North Carolina	3,571,623	764,559	21
Oregon	1,089,684	498,570	46
South Dakota	642,961	242,833	38
Virginia	2,677,773	386,998	14
Texas	6,414,824	1,061,563	17
Alaska	72,524	22,309	31
Hawaii	423,330	100,645	24

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I think I have had quite an experience with Territories. The State which I have the honor of representing today, North Dakota, has in its time belonged to 22 States and Territories of this Union. When Patrick Henry made his speech, "Give me liberty or give me death," North Dakota belonged to Virginia, and we had an awful time getting away from her. It was not until 1787, when Virginia gave up its rights to the Northwest Territory. We then belonged to the Northwest Territory, the area north of the Ohio River. In turn, we belonged to Ohio, with its capital at Chillicothe; and then Vincennes, Ind.; and then Dearborn, Ill.; and then Detroit, Mich.; and then Madison, Wis.; and then St. Paul, Minn.; and during this entire progress of North Dakota across the continent the same arguments were made when it was proposed that she be admitted as a State that are made here this afternoon. The same arguments were used against us in 1787 that are used here this afternoon against Alaska.

Then, when you get through with the eastern side of North Dakota, you have to start on the west side of the Missouri River. There we belonged to all those States from Louisiana clear through to the Dominion of Canada. Up to the time of our statehood in 1889 it was always said, on the occasion of every move we made to seek admission to the Union, that we were not ready for statehood, that we had everything under Territorial status that we could have as a State. You have seen here this afternoon Alaska represented by a brilliant man, Hawaii represented by an equally brilliant man. They are allowed to take part in the debate, but vote they may not. Is that a free government? Would statehood change that? It certainly would.

If the argument used here against the admission of Alaska had prevailed in the past, we would have no great Western States today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] a while ago made an observation to the effect that either he was fooled or those advocating the approval of this measure were fooled. I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia, if he is on the floor, what he thinks about the great public-opinion polls that have been taken on this question throughout the United States. Perhaps all of the people of this country are fooled on this question; perhaps all of the people making up the vast majority of the affirmative side in those polls were fooled. Can any man argue that the people, those out through the hinterland down to the grass roots, would deny these rights to these great people of Hawaii and Alaska?

There is such a thing as public opinion in this country; and, thank God, now and then it operates. That public opinion, according to the information that comes to this Nation's Capital, which, incidentally, has become the capital of the world, shows that our people are not only willing but anxious for these two Territories to have statehood.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield to the gentleman.

People ask, "What could you have under statehood that you do not have under a Territorial status?" Let me ask the other 434 Members of this House, "Would you have your State revert to a Territorial status?" Of course, you would not, because you know good and well that under a Territorial status the people do not have the protections that they have with their voting representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the arguments in debate both pro and con on this matter and have studied the subject considerably. I am firmly convinced that the time has come when we should admit Alaska into the Union. The question of statehood for Alaska has been pending for a considerable period of time—a time which has permitted every Member of the Congress to become thoroughly acquainted with the factors involved in extending the status of statehood to one of our largest and certainly one of our most strategic Territories.

It is not my purpose to look at the question that is before us today from the point of view of what statehood would mean to the people of Alaska. However, I wish to confine my remarks to a much more important aspect of this question—the question of providing defenses for our Nation and the unquestionably and undeniable strategic position which Alaska occupies in relation to our global defenses and outposts. In other words, what statehood for Alaska would mean to the United States. We should make Alaska a fortification of defense for America.

In this connection, I beg the indulgence of the membership of the House to repeat two statements of two of our most able military leaders and pioneers in air power.

Many years ago the late Billy Mitchell, one of the greatest pioneers in air power that this country has ever produced, stated: "He who holds Alaska holds the world."

At a later time and following the complete fulfillment of the prophesies and predictions of General Mitchell, the late General Arnold said, "Upon Alaska our future may well rest."

Yes, in our world today Alaska is of great importance. What could insure greater provision for our future than to recognize the truth of the facts as stated by these eminent military men?

Let us fortify Alaska against any possible aggression. Alaska may well hold the key to our future security and we should thus make of this Territory an arsenal and a bulwark of democracy. This can truly be accomplished through statehood, and I fear only through statehood.

The question properly arises as to whether we can adequately prepare our defenses—which are acknowledgedly so vital in Alaska—unless we admit the Territory into the constitutional Union as a State. I repeat, I believe that we cannot.

Resettlement will not materially grow further for Alaska as a Territory. As a State, Alaska will be settled, developed, and grow into a bulwark of defense. GI's and others will settle there under the incentive of American statehood.

Alaska, Mr. Chairman, constitutes so vital a bulwark in the defense of our country that I hesitate to dwell upon the possibilities or the consequences of our failure to insure its complete and impregnable defense.

The Territory of Alaska is the closest point under the United States flag to Soviet Russia. It is strategically located in relation to the island of Formosa which now has become so critical in the light of recent global disturbances. I do not have the figures to quote at this point—and I think they may be somewhat unnecessary because they are so well known to all of us—but the air hours lying between Alaska and Soviet Russia and its satellite territories are virtually negligible—certainly, they cannot afford any degree of comfort.

Alaska today can readily be reached by all means of transportation—land, sea and air. We have already built the Alcan Highway to Alaska—a needed network of defense. The presence of this highway and the expense to which we went in effecting its construction certainly indicates that road transportation to Alaska was and is of the utmost importance.

Thus we have already made the Territory of Alaska as contiguous, in a sense, to our country as California is contiguous to my own State of Tennessee—by highway. By air, Alaska is only a negligible number of hours distance. Therefore, we cannot longer argue that Alaska is isolated—having a foreign point of view and lacking in a common interest with the 48 States. That is no longer true.

The people of Alaska have proved themselves through 87 years in the status of a possession of the United States—39 of which years have been in the status of Territory—to be loyal American citizens. They enjoy, shall we say, the same penalties as continental American citizens—income taxes, excise taxes and such. The citizens of Alaska have fought through three wars of this country.

The population of Alaska while still small—totaling approximately 100,000 today—has been swelled by many loyal and pioneering citizens of continental United States who have settled there and who have helped to promote its economic interest—and therefore the economic interest of the entire United States.

The last territories to be admitted into the Union were Arizona and New Mexico—in the year 1912, I believe. It was argued at that time that the populations of those Territories were too small for the granting of complete and full statehood. But how does that argument stand now? Statehood has been a major factor in the growth and development of those former Territories—I think no one will gainsay that statement. Alaska with a population of approximately 100,000 today is every bit as important and vital—vital and important to the defense of our country.

Mr. Chairman, under the conditions prevailing today in our international relations we are called upon to exercise foresight in our national interest and safety—and bring Alaska into full statehood.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that Alaska will become the forty-ninth State of our Union. I will vote in favor of this resolution and I hope it will pass well nigh unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, purchase of the vast Territory of Alaska from Russia in 1867 for only $7,200,000, was termed by the then opponents of Government spending, as Seward's folly." William H. Seward was United States Secretary of State, who negotiated the purchase. Russia, during the darkest days of our Civil War, was friendly to the Union, and opposed contemplated recognition of the confederacy by the Emperor Louis Bonaparte, of France, and by the English Government.

To emphasize that friendship, and as a belligerent gesture against Great Britain and France, whose governments threatened to intervene in the War Between the States on the side of the South, the Czar sent his war fleet to New York and up the Potomac to our Capital. Britain and France backed down. The purchase price for Alaska was considered liberal at that time by our officials to compensate Russia for the expense of the long voyage and prolonged stay in American waters of its war fleet.

The wheel of fortune has revolved. Czarist Russia proved our mightiest friend at a time of threatened national disunity. Communist Russia is presently our bitterest, most feared, enemy, and is preparing to wage war against us.

With the Soviet Union threatening the peace of the world as an aggressor nation, the fact that Alaska is but a few miles from Soviet territory and only minutes away as war planes travel, is an important argument for the admission of Alaska into statehood now. We must keep in mind that two world wars are two too many. We must do all things within our power to prevent war and maintain peace for all time.

Very thorough plans should be made to rebuild Alaskan defenses and to man World War II air bases in Alaska by additional ground forces. In fact, admission of Alaska to statehood will serve notice upon the Communists of Russia that we realize the importance of Alaska in the defense of this Nation against dictatorship aggression, that we propose to build our defenses in Alaska to a strength sufficient to repel any attack from the Soviet Union and that this forty-ninth State will no longer be a vulnerable spot for the defense of the United States. A dictator fears and respects force.

To the argument that admission of Alaska to statehood would give two votes in the United States Senate for a population of somewhat more than 100,000, those of us who favor immediate admission of this frontier Territory assert that a glance back over the years will demonstrate that some of our greatest Senators have come from States of small populations. One example would be Senator Norris, of Nebraska; others could be Senators McNary, of Oregon; and Key Pittman, of Nevada. There are many others. A present example would be Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. Truly, one cannot say that the votes of Senators from States such as Ohio have been more noticeably in the Nation's interest than have those from Nebraska, Nevada, Colorado, and other States of small population.

It is my earnest hope that during the present session of this Congress both branches of this Congress will vote affirmatively for admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States in the Union.

The Soviet press describes Alaska as "Soviet territory in the hands of an alien power." The article states that "This Territory was sold without authority by the corrupt Czarist regime."

This is just another item indicative that President Truman's strong foreign policy is sound. Furthermore, it gives force to arguments advanced by many Congressmen that we must strengthen our Army and Air Force in Alaska. Also, while on the subject, would not granting Alaska statehood be a good answer to the absurd Russian claims?

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I reiterate the statements made by the gentlemen who have just preceded me. I trust that both Alaska and Hawaii will be admitted to the great community of States of the United States.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, having pioneered in the West, I am sure that Alaska is just as capable of supporting its population as Sweden, Norway, and Finland. I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact I have so many problems confronting my district and State, I try to refrain from appearing on the floor very often on legislation other than that affecting my district and State; however, in this instance I find that I have a duty to perform due to the fact I was a member of both of the committees which had to do with making the investigation for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that Alaska is our last and our first frontier. Billy Mitchell said: "He who holds Alaska holds the world." If Billy Mitchell had not been court-martialed the United States would have been 25 years ahead in air power.

I think that there are issues that are most important in this matter which have been lost sight of. One is that brought out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], which is a threat to our national defense and that has been alluded to by those who have preceded me.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that apparently very few Members of the House have read the Life magazine issue of February 27, 1950, wherein the national defense story of Alaska is more vividly given than can be translated into words at this time. As has been pointed out, Soviet Russia is only 54 miles across the Bering Strait from Alaska. Bombers can cross that distance in 10 or 15 minutes, and a photograph in Life magazine shows the location of nine Russian air bases directly opposite Alaska.

If you should be able to secure a copy of this Life magazine I invite your attention to a comparison of the military strength of the Soviet Union and that of the United States. The national income of the Soviet Union is $65,000,000,000, and of the United States $222,000,000,000. The military share of that income in Russia is 25 percent, in the United States 6 percent.

Comparing our Air Force with Russia's air force, combat planes, Russia, 9,000; United States, 3,300. Transport and others, Russia, 8,000; United States, 5,600. Annual production of planes, 7,000 in Russia; 1,200 in the United States.

The Army: Russia 2,600,000, United States 640,000. Russia, infantry and airborne divisions, 125; United States, 9. Armored divisions: Russia, 30; United States, 1.

Navy: Submarines, Russia, 270; United States, 74.

Surface vessels: Russia, 127; United States, 164.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, it has sometimes been said that Alaska should not ever be admitted to the Union because it is noncontiguous territory, separated from the United States by foreign land and foreign waters. There is nothing in the Constitution which limits Territories eligible for statehood to those within the continental limits, as that phrase is customarily used. There was a time when an objection of noncontiguity might have had some merits as being in reality an objection to remoteness, but even on that basis, the objection now lacks substance. The major cities of Alaska are now linked to the States by air, road, and radio, so that they are for practical purposes closer to the States than New York or Boston were to the Capital in the early days of the United States.

Alaska is linked to the United States by three regularly scheduled air carriers operating through the gateways of Minneapolis, Chicago, and Seattle. Additional service is under consideration by the Civil Aeronautics Board at the present time. Alaskans are asking that an Alaskan carrier be given a certificate to fly between the States and Alaska, pointing to the demonstrated success of local carriers within the Territory. Much of Alaska's development is directly due to the activities of the bush pilots, civilian fliers operating their own private planes, who carry passengers and cargo to all parts of the Territory in all kinds of weather, and reaching areas otherwise inaccessible during the winter. Per capita, Alaskans fly 30 times as much as continental Americans.

Alaska is also linked to the United States by overland route, via the Alaska Highway. It is now possible to drive from Washington, D. C., and to reach Fairbanks or Anchorage in a few days. Motorist facilities in the form of accommodations, gas stations, and so forth, are being built along the highway and some 7,000 or 8,000 cars traveled along it last year. With the granting of statehood thousands more will move along the highway, and this is no reason why the large motor caravans now moving goods by truck for East and West along the central highways, should not in few years be moving north to the metropolitan of Alaska, growing larger year by year. There is now a good system of highways in the Territory, it is improving annually. The Alaska Railroad furnishes a modern service along 500 miles through the heart of the Territory from Seward and Whittier through Anchorage to Fairbanks. With enactment of statehood a very serious restraint upon Alaska's development, which now exists, should be removed. It is a provision in the Jones Act, enacted in 1920, under which merchandise originating in the States cannot be shipped to a port in Alaska from the States via Canadian rail and Canadian vessel nor from a port in Alaska to the States via Canadian vessel and Canadian rail, although merchandise traveling from a point in the States to another point in the States may be carried on a Canadian vessel and rail as part of a through haul. This discriminatory provision applies to Alaska alone. It would disappear upon statehood, leaving Alaska subject to the coastwise shipping laws only, which are likewise applicable to the States. A great impetus would be given to the development of Alaskan industry as a consequence of the application of the automatic removal of this discriminatory provision to Alaska.

It thus appears that although Alaska is linked adequately to the United States to demonstrate the lack of merit of any objection to statehood on the grounds of distance, Alaska does suffer from discriminatory treatment and inadequacy of transportation facilities in terms of their potential contribution to Alaska's development. These evils can be cured only by statehood.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak my fidelity to the pledge of the Democratic Party in the national platform upon which I was elected, the pledge to give to the people of Alaska the dignity of statehood. Many States have been admitted into the Union during the span of my lifetime. Many new stars have come to add new beauty to that field of blue in the flag of our country. The admission of each new State has added to the strength of our Republic. The debate in the Congress in opposition to statehood bills may have been waged in sincerity and with heated ardor, but I do not know of anyone now who would turn the legislative clock back and take from any of the States admitted in my lifetime the statehood given them and which they have justified by their good deeds and the service in this Congress of able Representatives and Senators. It will be the same with Alaska, and it is a very happy day in my life that I am here to cast my vote for Alaskan statehood. As I have sat here in this Chamber during the course of the brilliant debate which has been going on I have been thinking of the many fine young men and women, representing all the States of the Union, who went to Alaska and the Aleutian Islands in the period of the recent war. Many of our young men were killed or died of exposure in those days of peril and of

hardship. In voting for this bill I am voting to make the land where rest their bodies a sovereign State of the Republic for which they gave their lives.

My vote for statehood for Alaska I cast with the thought that it is something in the spirit, if not indeed the nature, of a memorial to these young heroes; some of whom were the comrades and the warm friends of my own son Lorence in the rugged and perilous months before the Jap attack on Dutch Harbor and until the islands had been cleared of the enemy and all Alaska girded for any hostile onslaught. The bodies of many of our flyers, lost in the icy waters or in the crevasses of the mountains, were never recovered. With the passage of this bill, and its enactment, the place where their unfound bodies repose will be part of a sovereign State of the Union. It may be only a sentiment, Mr. Chairman, but to me when Alaska is admitted, her star on that field of blue will stand as a vital memorial to the Unknown Soldier of the Alaska-Aleutian campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all that part of the United States now embraced within the Territory of Alaska, including a distance of one marine league from the line of coast, shall become the State of Alaska as hereinafter provided, but not beyond the international boundary of the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on account of my great admiration of and affection for the two delegates from the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and I do hold them both in very high esteem, and likewise on account of my admiration and great respect for the Governors of Alaska and Hawaii, I am somewhat reluctant to oppose them on the issue here involved, that of granting statehood to the Territories which they have so well and faithfully served.

Mr. Chairman, I shall always remember the warm and cordial reception which was accorded me on the occasion of my visits both to Alaska and to Hawaii. The friendliness and the genuine hospitality of the people of both Territories made a great and lasting impression upon me.

I frankly do not believe that either Alaska or Hawaii is now ready for statehood. If the pending measures are finally approved, Alaska and Hawaii will become States of the American Union. It is easy to see, if this is done, that by the same persuasive arguments we may next month or next year be called upon to grant statehood to Puerto Rico and even perhaps to the Virgin Islands, or we might even be asked to grant statehood to the Islands of Guam and Okinawa. If we could shuffle around the populations of the world to suit our own selves, we might be able to solve the perplexing problems which now confront us. Alaska is a vast area, twice the size of the great State of Texas; it is sparsely settled; it is tough and rugged country; and its population is perhaps only eighty or eighty-five thousand people. Approximately 30 percent of the population are Indians or Eskimos, living on the Yukon, and in the frigid North, beyond the Arctic Circle and on the shores of the Arctic Ocean. There in that cold Territory Mount McKinley lifts its snow-capped head 20,000 feet into the air and above the clouds. It is the largest peak in this part of the world, and its beauty is superb, but it stands in loneliness, far removed from the noises of a modern civilization.

Puerto Rico, on the other hand, presents an entirely different picture. If all of the people of this world were brought into the United States, and all of the factories and mines of this great country were taken out, we would then have a situation here comparable with that which exists in Puerto Rico. More than 650 persons per square mile, and all depend almost entirely upon the products of agriculture. I mention Puerto Rico because it has been mentioned along with Alaska and Hawaii in connection with local self-government and ultimate statehood. All three were mentioned in the Democratic platform of 1940. This bill which provides statehood for Alaska is only the beginning. On more than one occasion political platforms have contained pious pronouncements about self-government and statehood for the Territories, including Puerto Rico. We are now playing politics; yes, perhaps we are playing with the very destiny of our Nation and with the future of this great Union. Both political parties have been playing politics with this issue and they have magnified it out of all proportion. Why should we play politics with an issue so important? Where on earth has there ever been a situation comparable with the situation now presented? Imagine forty or fifty thousand white men, women, and thirty or forty thousand Eskimos or Indians in a Territory twice the size of Texas, asking for all of the privileges and blessings of statehood, and asking for the privilege of equal representation with the great States of this Union in the Senate of the United States. Those of you who are now advocating and urging statehood for Alaska are unwilling to say on the floor of this House that you would vote to give statehood to Puerto Rico or to the Virgin Islands, or to others who are today living under our flag. Puerto Rico is under the Stars and Stripes, and in Puerto Rico they sing "The Star-Spangled Banner." Yes, Puerto Rico, too, is standing in line for statehood. Are you willing to go all the way or do you want just what you are asking for and no more? Look at the Democratic platform of 1940 and then explain why Puerto Rico has been left out. Look at both party platforms in 1944 and give us the reasons for making the distinction.

In the 1944 Republican platform is this language about Puerto Rico:

Statehood is a logical aspiration of the people of Puerto Rico, who were made citizens of the United States by Congress in 1917. Legislation affecting Puerto Rico, insofar as feasible, should be in harmony with the realization of that aspiration.

There you have it, two great political parties putting platform planks before the people of the country, holding out the hope of statehood to the crowded people of Puerto Rico, where they have more than 650 human beings per square mile and are restricted in their economy to that of an agricultural state. How can we be consistent if we deny statehood to Puerto Rico? They are distressed. They need the help of this great country. They are entitled to the same consideration because they are under the same flag and subjected to the same burdens as are the people of Alaska and Hawaii.

If you vote for this, just bear in mind that this is the opening wedge. You will fill the United States Senate with Senators from Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or the other islands of the Pacific.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the gentleman's contention that Puerto Rico should be added to Hawaii and Alaska?

Mr. COOLEY. No, my contention is clearly not that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is against them all?

Mr. COOLEY. My contention is that they should remain in the same status they are now. I am unwilling to grant statehood to Alaska or Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman recognize this difference, that Hawaii was annexed on the basis of a voluntary movement on the part of the Hawaiians, that we bought Alaska, and that Puerto Rico was conquered?

Mr. COOLEY. I know all about that history. We bought and paid for Alaska. If we were to withdraw our men and our employees from Alaska today they could not carry on. If we were to turn over to them now the Alaskan Railroad and give it to them free of charge, they could not operate it 1 week. It is the most expensive railroad in the world to operate. The maintenance is exorbitant.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Was the gentleman from North Carolina a member of the platform committee of the Democratic Party in 1948?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I was not.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to state that the gentleman from Colorado was a member. I dislike the statements the gentleman makes regarding the political situation.

Mr. COOLEY. What is it that the gentleman objects to? I read the words from the platform. I reiterate, regardless of what the gentleman says, this is a political proposition. Nobody can justify granting statehood to Alaska on any basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that he and I get along fine, generally speaking.

Mr. COOLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. JENSEN. We do differ in matters of great importance, and we have on several occasions. May I ask the gentleman if he does not feel the conditions we face today should not have bearing on this matter regardless of whether it was in the Democratic or the Republican platform?

Mr. COOLEY. From the national defense standpoint?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. No.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman tell the House whether or not any type of defense has been requested by the Department of Defense for Alaska which has been denied or has not been provided?

Mr. JENSEN. That is not the question.

Mr. COOLEY. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi I can only say that I am not aware of the fact that any type of defense which has been requested has been denied. Certainly every man and woman in this House appreciates the great importance of Alaska in the defense program of this Nation. In providing adequate defense and in our great desire to protect the integrity of our Territory, we are usually influenced and guided by those in charge of our defense program. Pray tell me why our defense would be improved by merely granting statehood to Alaska? Would statehood give strength to Alaska and make the Territory stronger? Would statehood improve the economy of the Territory or increase its population? The gentleman from Iowa made a statement here a moment ago to the effect that Alaska, if granted statehood, would fight for America; that its manhood would stand and defend the great mainland and afford us opportunity to prepare for another gigantic war. Alaska, without the aid of the Federal Government does not have manpower, machinery, or military equipment enough to defend this mainland even for 1 hour.

Mr. JENSEN. That is the reason for statehood.

Mr. COOLEY. Giving them statehood and the dignity of two Senators and a Congressman will not strengthen our military defenses in that great Territory.

Mr. JENSEN. We would get more people up there if we passed this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. What is it about statehood which has an inherent attraction for people? The Territory has been under the flag for about 83 years and now it has the population of only about 83,000 people. At that rate it will take about 200 more years before they will have as many people in Alaska as I now have in my own congressional district.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I point out that during the entire time from 1940 to 1946 Alaska gave 3,564 inductees to the service? They have two National Guard units there. It is very well known they could not possibly defend Alaska. Furthermore the problem is strictly a national problem. We will defend any of our Territories whether they are States or not.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, we will defend Alaska with all the might of this great Nation and with all of the military forces at our command. All of this talk about adding strength to our military might and to our national defense by passing a Federal law which grants statehood to Alaska is nothing more nor less than "tommyrot." Where our flag is there we shall be also, and the world certainly should now know that the great might and power and all of the rich resources of America will protect the people that live under our flag. Have we, for the moment, forgotten Pearl Harbor? Hawaii was not then a State, but when the attack came at Pearl Harbor the might and power of this gigantic Nation were aroused and boys from every State rallied to the flag and to the defense of that outpost. Why do not we look this issue square in the face and settle it on its merits? Let us forget the silly and sentimental appeals and stand forthright in behalf of our own thinking?

I know a little something about the Territory of Alaska. I have traveled in every part of that great Territory. I accompanied Mr. Krug, the Secretary of the Interior, on his first inspection trip in 1946 and I went from one part of it to the other, even to Point Barrow on the Arctic Ocean. I ate bear meat with the Eskimos and I saw the caribou and the reindeer; the snowdrifts and the landslides; and I visited the fertile valleys and lofty peaks. I met genial and friendly people and I tried to learn something about their problems. I know that from Ladd Field, in Fairbanks; more than 9,000 American planes piloted by Russian pilots took off under secret orders for destinations unknown to us—but across the Bering Sea, and I know full well that some day some of those same planes might come back again to Fairbanks. If they do, I do not want them to be met by the National Guard of Alaska but rather by all of the might and force which our military men may muster.

Alaska is not ready for statehood. We are told that of its entire population only about 22,000 are eligible to vote. In the plebiscite only about 16,000 did vote and of the 16,000 voting, 40 percent did not want statehood for the Territory. But, even if all of them wanted it, is that a sound argument why the Representatives of these 48 great States should grant it? In the acquisition of Alaska maybe Russia does think we perpetrated a fraud and bought it for a song. What do we care about what Russia thinks. We know that Russia knows that we will defend every inch of that Territory with every instrumentality at our command.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. All citizens of the United States who are qualified to vote for representatives of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates, having the same qualifications, to form a constitutional convention in said Territory. The convention shall consist of 26 delegates apportioned among the several judicial divisions of Alaska as follows: First judicial division, 8 delegates; second judicial division, 4 delegates; third judicial division, 8 delegates; fourth judicial division, 5 delegates; and 1 delegate to be chosen at large from the entire Territory.

The Governor of Alaska shall, within 30 days after the approval of this act, issue a proclamation ordering an election of such delegates to be held at a time designated in the proclamation within 8 months after the approval of this act, and providing also for preceding primary election and for filings by independent or nonparty candidates, which proclamation shall be issued at least 2 months prior to the time of holding said primary election and 5 months before the date of election of such delegates. The nomination, filing, and election of such delegates shall be conducted, the returns made, the results ascertained, and the certificates of persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner, as nearly as is practicable as is prescribed by the laws regulating nominations and elections of members of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska.

SEC. 3. The delegates to the convention so elected shall meet at the capital of said Territory on the first Tuesday following the ninetieth day after their election, for a session of not to exceed 75 days, and after organization shall declare on behalf of the people of the proposed State that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, whereupon the said convention shall form a constitution and State government for the proposed State.

The constitution shall be republican in form, shall make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Said convention shall provide, by ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said State:

First. That perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

Second. That said State and its people do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to any lands or other property, the title to which is retained in or ceded to the United States by the provisions of this act and to all lands lying within its boundaries owned or held by any Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos hereinafter called natives, the right or title to which shall have been acquired through or from the United States or any prior sovereignty, and that until the title of the United States or of such natives shall have been disposed of or extinguished the same shall be and remain subject to the

disposition and under the absolute jurisdiction and control of the Congress of the United States; that no taxes shall be imposed by the State upon lands or property therein belonging to or which may hereafter be acquired by the United States or reserved for its use; but nothing herein, or in the ordinance herein provided for, shall preclude the said State from taxing, as other lands and other property are taxed, any lands and other property owned or held by any native outside of a native reservation unless otherwise prohibited by Congress.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Alaska shall be assumed and paid by said State and all debts owed to said Territory of Alaska shall be collected by said State.

Fourth. That provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Fifth. That all provisions of this act reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property herein made to said State, are consented to fully by said State and its people.

Sixth. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

SEC. 4. The State of Alaska and its political subdivisions, respectively, shall have and retain title to all property, real and personal, title to which is now in the Territory of Alaska or any of the subdivisions. The United States shall retain title to all property, real and personal, to which it now has title, including public lands, except as provided in section 5 hereof.

SEC. 5. Sections Nos. 2, 16, 32, and 36 in each township in the State of Alaska are hereby granted to the said State for the support of its common schools; and section 33 in each township in the Tanana Valley between parallels 64 and 65 north latitude and between the one hundred and forty-fifth and one hundred and fifty-second degrees of west longitude (meridian of Greenwich) are granted to said State for the support of an agricultural college and school of mines: *Provided*, That where settlement with a view to homestead entry has been made upon any part of the sections granted hereby before the survey thereof in the field, or where the same may have been sold or otherwise appropriated by or under the authority of any act of Congress, or are subject to any unextinguished native rights, or are wanting or fractional in quality, other lands may be selected and appropriated in lieu thereof in the manner provided by the act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. 796; 43 U. S. C., sec. 851). The right of lieu selection under the act of February 28, 1891, supra, shall be applicable only to lands within the same land district as the sections granted hereby: *Provided further*, That the State may not select in any one township land which together with land previously acquired under this section will exceed 50 percent of the surveyed area of such township. The grant of sections 2, 16, 32, 36, and 33 made above shall be subject to the act of January 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1026), as amended May 2, 1932 (47 Stat. 140; 43 U. S. C., sec. 870). Subsection (c) of section 1 of the said act of January 25, 1927, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the words "and all lands in the Territory of Alaska are excluded from the provisions of this Act".

The grants of sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 to said State, within national forests now existing or proclaimed, shall not vest the title to said sections in said State until the part of said national forests embracing any of said sections is restored to the public domain; but said granted sections shall be administered as a part of said forest. At the close of each fiscal year there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State such proportion of the moneys received during the fiscal year from said national forests as the area of the lands granted by this section, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, bears to the total area of said national forests, the areas of said sections when unsurveyed to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior by protraction or otherwise.

Block 32, and the structures and improvements thereon, in the city of Juneau are granted to the State of Alaska to use for a dwelling for the Governor, for a State museum, and for park and recreational purposes: *Provided*, That if at any time for a period of 3 years none of the said block is used for any of the specified purposes, the block shall revert to the United States as a part of the public domain.

The following grants of land are hereby made for internal improvements:

For legislative, executive, and judicial public buildings heretofore erected in said Territory or to be hereafter erected in the proposed State, 300,000 acres; for insane asylums, 100,000 acres; for penitentiaries, 100,000 acres; for schools and asylums for the deaf, dumb, and the blind, 100,000 acres; for normal schools, 200,000 acres; for State charitable, penal, and reformatory institutions, 100,000 acres; for homes for pioneer residents, 100,000 acres.

All the property of the United States situated in the Territory of Alaska used in connection with the conservation and protection of the fisheries and of the fur and game of Alaska is hereby transferred and conveyed to the State of Alaska. The State of Alaska shall possess and exercise the same jurisdiction and control over the fisheries and the fur and game of Alaska as are possessed and exercised by the several States within their respective territorial limits, including adjacent waters.

Grants previously made to the Territory of Alaska are hereby confirmed and transferred to the State of Alaska, upon its admission. No grants, other than those specified in this act, shall be made to the State of Alaska by reason of its becoming or being a State, except by subsequent legislation.

The schools and colleges provided for in this section shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

Five percent of the proceeds of sales of public lands lying within said State which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to such sales, shall be paid to the said State to be used for the support of the common schools within said State.

SEC. 6. After a constitution and State government have been formed in compliance with the provisions of this act, the convention forming the same shall provide by ordinance for submitting said constitution, for ratification or rejection, to the people of said proposed State at an election to be held at a date to be fixed by said convention, which shall be not less than 75 nor more than 100 days from the date of its adjournment, at which election the citizens of said proposed State who are qualified to vote for members of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska shall vote directly for or against the proposed constitution and for or against any provisions separately submitted. The returns of said election shall be made to the Governor of Alaska, who shall cause the same to be canvassed by the canvassing board of the Territory of Alaska in the manner now provided by law for the canvass of votes cast in general Territorial elections, and if a majority of the votes cast on that question shall be for the constitution, the Governor of the Territory of Alaska shall certify the result to the President of the United States, together with a statement of the votes cast thereon and upon separate articles and propositions, together with a copy of said constitution, articles, propositions, and ordinances. If the constitution and government of said proposed State are republican in form, and if all the provisions of the act have been complied with in the formation thereof, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to certify said facts to the Governor of said Territory, who shall within 30 days after receipt of such notification from the President of the United States issue a proclamation for the election of all State and other officers provided for in said constitution including members of State legislature, said election to take place not earlier than 2 months nor later than 6 months after the date of issuance of said proclamation by the Governor.

SEC. 7. (a) The constitutional convention shall by ordinance provide that in case of ratification of the constitution by the people and in case the President of the United States approves the same, an election shall be held at the time named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory hereinbefore provided, at which election officers for a full State government, including a Governor, members of the State legislature, one Representative and two Senators in the Congress of the United States to be elected at large from said State, and such other officers as the constitution shall prescribe, shall be chosen by the qualified voters of Alaska. Unless the constitutional convention shall by ordinance otherwise provide, such election, and an antecedent primary election, shall be held, and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified by the canvassing board, in the same manner, as nearly as practicable, as is now prescribed by law for the nomination, filing, and election, and canvass and certification of election of Territorial officers and members of the Territorial legislature. When such State and other officers and members of the State legislature and a Representative and Senators in the Congress of the United States shall be so elected and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified as herein provided, the Governor of said Territory shall certify the result of said election to the President of the United States, who shall thereupon immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States the State of Alaska shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with each of the other States of the Union, and the Representative and Senators from said State in the Congress of the United States so elected and certified shall thereupon be entitled to seats in the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States and to all of the rights and privileges of Representatives and Senators therein. Until the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and until said State is so admitted into the Union and said officers are elected and qualified under the provisions of the Constitution, all of the officers of said Territory, including the Delegate in Congress from said Territory, shall continue to discharge the duties of said respective offices in and for said Territory.

Upon admission of Alaska as a State as herein provided and upon election and qualification of the officers of the State government formed in pursuance of and in accordance with the provisions of said constitution, said officers shall forthwith proceed to exercise all of the duties and functions of their respective offices; and all of the laws in force in the Territory of Alaska at the time of admission of said State into

the Union shall be and continue in full force and effect throughout said State except as modified or changed by this act, or by the constitution of the State, or as thereafter modified or changed by the legislature of the State. All of the laws of the United States not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within said State as elsewhere within the United States.

(b) Subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761, 762), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Each State other than Alaska shall be entitled, in the Seventy-eighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or such section 22, as amended by this act, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1941, based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member; and the State of Alaska shall be entitled to one Representative from the time of its admission into the Union until the taking effect of such a reapportionment."

SEC. 8. The sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for defraying the expenses of the elections provided for in this act and of the convention, and for the payment of the members and officers and employees thereof under the same rules and regulations and at the same rates as are now provided by law for the payment of the Territorial Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, and the disbursements of the money appropriated by this section shall be made by the secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall affect the establishment, or the right, ownership, and authority of the United States in Mount McKinley National Park, as now or hereafter constituted; but exclusive jurisdiction, in all cases, shall be exercised by the United States for the national park, as now or hereafter constituted; saving, however, to the State of Alaska the right to serve civil or criminal process within the limits of the aforesaid park in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in said State, but outside of said park; and saving further to the said State the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and property on the lands included in said park; and saving also to the persons residing now or hereafter in such area the right to vote at all elections held within the respective political subdivisions of their residence in which the park is situated.

SEC. 10. Said State when admitted as provided herein shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the "district of Alaska." Mount McKinley National Park shall also constitute a part of said judicial district, and the district court in and for said district shall have jurisdiction over all offenses committed within the boundaries of said park. All fugitives from justice taking refuge in said park shall be subject to the same laws as refugees from justice found in the State of Alaska. The United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall hold one term at Juneau, one term at Anchorage, one term at Fairbanks, and one term at Nome each year, and special terms may be held at such times and places in said district as the judge thereof may deem expedient. The said district shall, for judicial purposes, until otherwise provided, be attached to the ninth judicial circuit. There shall be appointed for said district one district judge, one United States attorney, and such assistant United States attorneys, not exceeding four in number, as the Attorney General of the United States may determine, and one United States marshal with such number of deputies as may be designated by the Attorney General of the United States. There shall be appointed one clerk for said district, who shall keep offices at Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Nome, and at such other places as may be designated by the district court, and such number of deputies and assistants and other employees as may be designated by the Attorney General of the United States. The regular and special terms of said court shall be held at the times designated by the judge thereof, and the judge is authorized to summon grand juries whenever the public business shall require. The district court for said district, and the judge thereof, shall possess the same powers and jurisdiction and perform the same duties as are held, exercised, and performed by other district courts and judges of district courts of the United States, and shall be governed by the same laws and regulations.

The United States attorney and assistant United States attorneys, the United States marshal and the deputy United States marshals, the clerk and his deputies, assistants and employees, the stenographers of the district court of said district, and all other officers and persons performing duties in the administration of justice therein, shall severally possess the powers and perform the duties lawfully required to be performed by similar officers in other districts of the United States, and shall, for the services they may perform, receive the same fees and compensation with allowances now prescribed by law for the officers performing similar service for the United States in other districts of the United States.

No person shall be eligible for appointment as United States district judge, United States attorney, United States marshal, or clerk of the District Court for the District of Alaska unless such person shall have been a bona fide resident of Alaska at least 3 years immediately prior to date of appointment.

SEC. 11. No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska on the date when said Territory shall become a State, and no case pending in an appellate court upon appeal from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time said Territory shall become a State, shall abate by the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, but the same shall be transferred and proceeded with as hereinafter provided.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said courts had been established prior to the accrual of said causes of action or the commission of such offenses; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska.

SEC. 12. All appeals and writs of error taken from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to the Supreme Court of the United States or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, previous to the admission of Alaska as a State, shall be prosecuted to final determination as though this act had been passed. All cases in which final judgment has been rendered in such district court, and in which appeals or writs of error might be had except for the admission of such State, may still be sued out, taken and prosecuted to the Supreme Court of the United States or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit under the provisions of then existing law, and there held and determined in like manner; and in either case, the Supreme Court of the United States, or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in the event of reversal, shall remand the said cause to either the State supreme court or other final appellate court of said State, or the United States district court for said district, as the case may require: *Provided*, That the time allowed by existing law for appeals and writs of error from the district court for said Territory shall not be enlarged thereby, and all appeals and writs of error not sued out from the final judgments of said court at the time of the admission of such State shall be taken within 6 months from such time.

SEC. 13. All causes pending in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time of the admission of Alaska as a State which are of such nature as to be within the jurisdiction of a district court of the United States shall be transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska for final disposition. All other causes pending in the district for the Territory of Alaska at the time of the admission of Alaska as a State shall be transferred to the appropriate State court of Alaska. All final judgments and decrees rendered upon such transferred cases in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska may be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States or by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the same manner as is now provided by law with reference to the judgments and decrees in existing United States district courts.

SEC. 14. Jurisdiction of all cases pending or determined in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska not transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall devolve upon and be exercised by the courts of original jurisdiction created by said State, which shall be deemed to be the successor of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska with respect to cases not so transferred and, as such, shall take and retain custody of all records, dockets, journals, and files of such courts pertaining to such cases. The files and papers in all cases so transferred to the United States district court, together with a transcript of all book entries to complete the record in such particular cases so transferred, shall be in like manner transferred to said district court.

SEC. 15. All cases pending in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time said Territory becomes a State not transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall be proceeded with and determined by the courts created by said State, with the right to prosecute appeals or writs of error to the appellate courts created by said State, and also with the same right to prosecute appeals or writs of error from the final determination in said causes made by the court of last resort created by such State to the Supreme Court of the United States, as now provided by law for appeals and writs of error from the court of last resort of a State to the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 16. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, after line 10, insert a new paragraph, reading as follows:

"Third. That authority is granted to and acknowledged in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as are now owned by the United States

and held for military, air, naval, or coast guard purposes, whether reserved or acquired by purchase, condemnation, donation, or exchange; saving, however, to the State of Alaska the right to serve civil or criminal process within the limits of the aforesaid reservations in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in said State, but outside of said reservation; and the Legislative Assembly is authorized and directed to enact any law necessary and proper to give effect to this article; and."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to enter into this debate. I am going to vote for the bill granting statehood to Alaska, as well as for the bill granting statehood to Hawaii.

But in view of the argument made by my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, I could not restrain myself when he said there were absolutely no grounds at all for admitting either of these possessions of ours into the Union, possessions where American citizens live.

As my friend was arguing, my mind went back to the early days of our constitutional government, when the United States of America was composed of 13 States.

Of course they were members by sovereign choice, because they had sovereignty before the Union itself was established. As my friend argued further I saw in my mind's eye this great Nation of ours of 48 States extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. The question arose in my mind: How were all these States admitted to the Union? If my memory serves me correctly, the answer is that it had to be by act of Congress. I went back in memory to the debates when those territories were being admitted to the Union as States, when bills were pending in this body. In those bygone decades, the very same arguments were made then as was made by my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. Every argument in favor of the admission of those territories to the Union as States applied then as it does now. American citizens lived in those territories. They progressed to the point where they could be admitted as States into the Union. You can go right down the line of States and name any one of the States which were admitted after the Thirteen Orginal States formed the Union and substantially the same arguments were made then as are being made now.

And if those arguments had prevailed, such as are being made here today, not one of them would be States in the Union today.

So it seems to me the argument of my friend falls to the ground.

Now, he says this is just politics. Why, the conduct of government itself is politics. Ours is a political institution. It is a school of political science. When the Republican Party and the Democratic Party put into their platforms the statement that they stand for admission into the Union of these Territories, it is politics in its wholesome sense and in its constructive sense, and not in any way in a sinister sense.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I intended to remain silent, except for my vote on this proposition.

But my conscience would not permit me to remain silent in view of the argument that my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, made when he said that there is no reason at all why these Territories should be admitted into the Union as States.

My mind went back, thinking of the debates in bygone days against the admission of States into the Union, when the same kind of arguments were made as my distinguished friend from North Carolina has made.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] said that Alaska could not defend itself. Could any State in the Union standing alone defend itself?

Mr. COOLEY. I did not make that statement, except in answer to a statement which had been made to show how ridiculous the question was.

Mr. McCORMACK. One of the provisions of the Constitution is that the Federal Government has to guarantee to every State a republican form of government. That is in the Constitution. I think that answers that question.

On the question of national defense, you look over a map of the world, and Alaska today and for many generations to come, if an emergency should arise, is probably the most important place in the world, and is certainly of vital importance to the United States of America.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The founders of this Government in 1787 wrote the fundamental law, and they provided that the great West should grow into commonwealths, and when they were of sufficient growth they should be admitted on terms of equality with the Original Thirteen States. That generous policy made America the greatest colonizing power in the world. What we are doing today to admit Alaska is to carry out the historic policy of this Government, so that when our children and our children's children shall move to the West they will have new States on terms of equality with the old Original Thirteen.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Furthermore, the smoke screen of Puerto Rico should not be used for inflammatory purposes. We are considering these two Territories upon their merits today. Puerto Rico is a question of tomorrow, and some future Congress will have to meet that problem.

As I listened to my very dear friend, my mind went back to yesterday when he was fighting to put through a bill, when there was a great deal of opposition on this floor. As chairman of this committee he expected us to support him, and I did support him, and others did. There is no more able man in this House, and I commend him, and I admire him very much. I value his friendship, but I reserve the right to disagree with him when he makes arguments like he did today; but yesterday, when he was fighting with his back to the wall, expecting defeat as a matter of fact, those of us rallied to his support and helped him put through his bill. I wonder how he would feel if the chairman of the committee had taken the floor yesterday in opposition to his bill. He probably would not like it.

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of the gentleman's argument is that, regardless of my convictions, I should follow the leadership of the chairman of this committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the argument you made in your own time you should have done so, because you failed to recognize any merit in either of these cases. You said there was no right. I think my friend has gone to the extreme, made the most weak and fallacious argument that, as chairman of a responsible committee, he could make. And rather than to take the floor in opposition to this bill he should either have remained silent or he should have followed the leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

I hope this bill will pass, and I hope the Hawaiian statehood bill will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the able and well-intentioned gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is just as much in error about this statehood bill this afternoon as he was when he led the fight to jam through the potato bill last year.

I am for this bill, first, because I think the people of Alaska want and have earned statehood; and also because I believe a resounding and preponderating vote for the bill this afternoon will cause the Kremlin to take pause.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I have done a very sinful thing. On yesterday I had a very pleasant argument with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina. He made some very fine arguments defending the premise that promises of the United States were sacred and should be fulfilled. He has changed his mind, apparently, because he is not holding to the same line of argument in debate today which he used on yesterday so effectively. I am, therefore, afraid that perhaps in my own ambition to protect the interests of my State I may have tripped somewhere along the line and said some things which took him off of the great statesmanlike manner in which he usually acquits himself.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that the platform did contain Puerto Rico. Is the gentleman willing to state on the floor as a Member of Congress that he will vote to carry out the platform pledge and give statehood to Puerto Rico?

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is doing as he did yesterday, attempting to put words in my mouth. We are discussing statehood for Alaska now, not Puerto Rico.

Mr. COOLEY. I know, but statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico were all contained in the 1940 platform.

Mr. MARSHALL. But the point brought out and emphasized so forcefully by the gentleman yesterday when we were talking about the responsibilities of the Federal Government and the Congress was that each should live up to its promises. We certainly have promised time and time again to the Territory of Alaska that it would be considered for statehood.

Mr. COOLEY. But the gentleman from North Carolina has never made any such promise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa brought to the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina the argument that he made yesterday. If the Government should keep its promise in a situation like that under discussion yesterday, certainly it should keep its promise made in its Constitution.

Mr. MARSHALL. Of course, the program under consideration today does not involve any question of pork barrel.

Mr. COOLEY. Yesterday we were dealing with signed contracts.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask someone who happens to have the RECORD in his pocket to read the language showing that the platform of either the major parties stated that they stood for statehood for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. COOLEY. I just sent the platform back to the cloak room. I read the section. I can get it again if the gentleman wants it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They stated that they advocated improvement for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico in the matter of their own local government.

What did the Congress do? The Congress provided that the Puerto Ricans could elect their own governor and the Honorable Muñoz Marin, who is now visiting in this city, is the first governor elected by the Puerto Ricans. You did carry out your platform pledge. I still challenge anyone to read from the platform of either party where either the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico were promised statehood under the platform commitments.

This is a smoke screen thrown up here for the purpose of defeating this bill. When we get to the proposition of giving other areas statehood, the bills will have to come to this floor according to the constitutional provision. We might as well get this fact fixed in our minds.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. I take this time in order to suggest a method of procedure. The bill has been considered read for amendment and is open to amendment at any point. There are several committee amendments pending. I suggest that it would be good procedure to dispose of the committee amendments first in an orderly fashion. We will know then how the bill stands and other amendments can be offered accordingly. I believe that by following this procedure we will get through more quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, the next committee amendments are on pages 4, 5, 6, and 7, and are merely corrective of section numbers. I ask that they be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 3, change the word "third" to the word "fourth."

Page 5, line 8, change the word "fourth" to the word "fifth."

Page 5, line 12, change the word "fifth" to the word "sixth."

Page 5, line 17, change the word "sixth" to the word "seventh."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 15, after the word "sold", insert "or may be included in a military or other reservation of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 8, after the word "of", insert "vacated, unappropriated, unreserved public."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice the Clerk is reading an amendment on page 8. I have an amendment to offer on page 6. When will my amendment be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state to the gentleman from Nebraska that the bill has been considered as read and open to amendment at any point, with the committee amendments to be acted on first.

The gentleman will be recognized to offer his amendment after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 20, after the word "acres." insert "Lands granted for the foregoing purposes will not be taken from lands included within a military or other reservation of the United States. The selections provided for in this paragraph shall be made in accordance with the procedure prescribed in Revised Statutes 2379 (43 U. S. C. 857)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other committee amendments?

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have two committee amendments which I offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON: Page 13, lines 19 through 25, and on page 14, lines 1 through 7, delete all existing language and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Upon admission of the proposed State into the Union the House of Representatives shall be composed of 436 Members until the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress."

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. You are increasing the number of Members of Congress now?

Mr. PETERSON. By one. The Delegate from Alaska becomes a Member until the Eighty-second Congress when this statehood proposition takes effect and until the next apportionment. That is what has been done in times past.

Mr. RICH. What does the committee expect to do when we come to Hawaii? Does it expect to increase the number again?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; the membership will be increased by two.

Mr. RICH. And when we come to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico?

Mr. PETERSON. We have not come to them.

Mr. RICH. You are starting out to increase the membership. The first thing you know you are going to get 500 or 600 Members in here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON: Page 16, strike out lines 8 to 12 inclusive and the words "the United States." in line 13.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, this has been unanimously approved by the committee and was done at the suggestion of the United States Court so that the clerk might come under the general code. When we started working on this bill the code made certain changes. This will make the clerk for that area come under the general code.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 6, line 4, strike out "Sections numbered 2, 16, 32, and 36" and insert "Even numbered sections."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, may I offer the other amendments at this time and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc?

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

On page 7, line 4, strike out "sections 2, 16, 32, 36" and insert "even numbered sections."

On page 7, line 11, strike out "sections 2, 16, 32, and 36" and insert "even numbered sections."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, my amendments are quite clear. In the bill we have before us we propose to give the sections numbered 2, 16, 32, and 36 in each township to the new State. That is 4 sections out of each 36. Today the Federal Government owns and controls 98 percent of the Territory of Alaska. My amendment gives half of the land to the State.

I offered this amendment in the Committee and it was turned down, partly because, I think, our good friend, the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, had felt that it would not be approved by the Department of the Interior, and I understand it does not have their approval.

But, I submit to you, my colleagues, that if a new State is to be formed, it ought to be granted sufficient territory in order to conduct its affairs. The average amount of land owned in the 12 Western States by the Federal Government is about 50 percent. In one or two States they own up to 80 percent of the land. Here we have a new State. Of course, it is vast in territory, one-fifth the size of the United States that we propose to take in as a new State. But, if we are going to bring it in, let us not make it a hollow mockery and give them something which they think they are going to have and yet we do not give to them. I submit that they at least should have half of the land, the even numbered sections, in each township. There are 36 sections in a township. Let us give them half of that land so that they may be able to endure and grow. At the present time the Department of the Interior so tightens down the Territory that they are unable to develop.

I know, Mr. Chairman, there is probably a message to be delivered to the House at this time, and I presume the Committee will rise temporarily. I submit to my colleagues that the legislation that is going to be presented to us in the message will be of some assistance to Alaska, because Alaska's steamship line may be tied up in strikes and absolutely paralyze this great Territory. I hope that when the legislation does come before us, that is now to be presented in a message from the President, that my colleagues will be men and not mice. This House has had a bill before it that provides for seizure but the leadership has not brought it up for consideration. The times demand courageous action

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawkes, one of his secretaries.

THE COAL SHORTAGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 492)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I wish to report to the Congress on the emergency confronting the Nation as a result of a shortage of coal, and to recommend legislative action.

Since February 6, 1950, the production of bituminous coal has been dangerously curtailed. By now, stocks of coal are almost exhausted, and many parts of our country face crisis conditions. The anthracite coal which is being produced, and the trickle of soft coal output, together have been enough to stave off human suffering. But the lack of normal production of soft coal is bringing many basic industries to a halt.

A variety of emergency measures have been taken in recent days and weeks. Transportation and utility services have been cut down. Available supplies in many localities have been redistributed in order to meet the most urgent needs. Other steps have been taken by States and cities, by industries and by suppliers, to conserve the dwindling stocks of coal. These efforts have stretched our national stock pile, but they cannot add to it. Within a very few days we shall be virtually out of soft coal. The danger to the national health and safety is real and immediate. It requires action at once.

The immediate reason for the curtailment of bituminous coal production is a dispute between most of the mine operators and the principal union of mine workers, the United Mine Workers of America, over the terms and conditions of employment in the mines.

The previous contract between the union and the operators expired June 30, 1949. In subsequent months, the mines operated intermittently, while negotiations for a new contract were under way. But these negotiations failed to produce agreement, and the miners went on strike on February 6, 1950.

On January 31, in an effort to avert this situation, I asked the operators and the union to agree to continue production, in the national interest, for 70 days, while a fact-finding board reviewed the issues and recommended fair and reasonable terms for settlement of the dispute. While this request was accepted by the operators, it was rejected by the union.

Thereafter, when negotiations were broken off and the strike occurred, I established a board of inquiry under the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947. It was this board's duty, under the law, to find the facts and to report them, but not to make recommendations.

The board reported to me on February 11. It found that during all the months of negotiation, neither side had bargained freely and effectively on the essential issues in dispute. The board also expressed a conviction which deserves emphasis today. The board concluded that—

> The obligation entrusted to the operators and to the union, as the agent of the employees, to serve in a joint stewardship of these vital resources must be met. The health and safety of the Nation demand this.

On the basis of the board's findings, along with the other evidence available, the Attorney General on February 11, at my direction, requested the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to enjoin the union from continuing the strike and to order both parties to bargain in good faith. That same day, the court issued a temporary restraining order to accomplish these purposes.

As a result, the parties renewed bargaining negotiations on February 15. The Board of Inquiry was reconvened and met repeatedly with the parties, in cooperation with the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, in an effort to bring about agreement.

But while negotiations have continued, the miners have not returned to work. On February 20, the Attorney General started proceedings against the union, charging that it had not obeyed the order enjoining the continuance of the strike, and that it was therefore in contempt of court. This action was taken in light of the fact that the work stoppage was still under way 9 days after the court's order. On March 2, the court found that the union was not in contempt.

It is evident that the order of the court has not brought forth production. The mines are still shut down. Events since the issuance of the court's order on February 11 give us no assurance that court action under present law can, in fact, end the work stoppage in time to avert exhaustion of our coal supplies.

The Nation's welfare requires that soft-coal production be resumed at once, in order to prevent human suffering and disastrous economic dislocation. Since the union and the operators have failed to resume production, and since recourse to the court has so far proved ineffective, it is now my plain duty to propose further action. Therefore, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the Government to take over the coal mines and operate them temporarily as a public service.

The parties are continuing their negotiations, and I earnestly hope that they will reach agreement before it actually becomes necessary for the Government to take possession of the mines. But we can wait no longer to prepare ourselves with the necessary legislative authority.

I am submitting at this time a draft of legislation to accomplish this purpose. I earnestly request that the Congress consider this proposal and enact the needed legislation as quickly as possible.

In requesting this legislation, it is my purpose and intention to restore the production of badly needed coal. During the period of Government possession of the mines, the owners should receive fair and just compensation for the use of their property, and the miners should receive fair and just compensation for their work. The proposed legislation would

authorize the establishment of impartial boards to make recommendations concerning fair and just compensation for the use of the property of the mine owners and for the work of the mine employees.

I am not requesting this legislation as a means of settling the issues in dispute between the operators and the union. They will have to settle their differences through their own collective bargaining, just as though Government operation were not in effect. I do not propose to substitute the Government's representatives for the private operators at the bargaining table. It will not be our purpose to establish wages, hours, or working conditions which would bind either the operators or the miners upon resumption of private operations.

When the country can be assured of sufficient supplies of coal, the Government will have no need to continue public operation and the mines will be promptly returned to private hands.

I have stressed these essential elements in the plan for Government operation, so that there will be no misunderstanding of the legislation I am recommending. The draft bill which I propose for consideration is necessarily quite general, so that the Government may adapt the details of its operations to changing circumstances. But while the legislative language can best be framed in general terms, there should be no mistaking the contemplated relationships of the Government with the operators and the miners during the period of public operation.

There are other issues in this emergency than the Nation's urgent need for coal. This crisis raises vital questions for the future of the coal industry.

We have arrived at the present impasse because both the operators and the union have failed, month after month, to make the efforts in genuine bargaining which could result in a mutually satisfactory settlement. They have been unwilling or unable to lay aside their charges and countercharges, moderate their fixed positions and undertake serious negotiation in a spirit of accommodation and mutual understanding.

They have been unwilling or unable to do so despite the country's desperate need, despite the growing distress of the idle miners and their families and the economic losses incurred by idle facilities, despite the competitive advantage which their long dispute is giving to other fuels.

Fortunately, this dangerous breakdown in the normal course of labor-management relations does not characterize most industries in this country. On the contrary, collective bargaining has generally produced sustained production and mutual benefits, without these serious consequences for the public and this need for extreme governmental action.

But the coal industry has failed signally to solve its own problems in the field of labor-management relations. The current failure is only the latest of a series which stretches back over many years, recurring with disheartening regularity. We can only assume that if this industry continues as it has been going, we shall be faced repeatedly with situations of this kind. We shall be forced every so often into governmental action of one kind or another—action which cannot solve the underlying problems or remedy the failures of the private parties, but which is necessary to shield the public from their consequences.

These recurrent break-downs between labor and management in the coal industry are only symptoms of profound and long-standing economic and social difficulties in which the industry has become involved. We can hope to work toward real solutions of the unstable relations between labor and management in the coal mines, only if we come to grips with the problems which foster instability.

I further recommend, therefore, that the Congress establish a commission of inquiry, including members from the Congress, the executive branch, and the public, to make a thorough study of the coal industry, in terms of economic, social, and national security objectives. The draft of legislation which I am submitting at this time does not include provisions for establishing such a commission. However, I expect to submit a draft of legislation for that purpose to the Congress at an early date.

Management in this industry is confronted by declining markets, severe competition, and the high cost of efficient, modern equipment. Labor faces arduous work, a harsh physical environment, an uncertain work year, and the prospect of fewer jobs. The Nation needs an assured supply of coal at all times, and readily available reserves to buttress our national security.

It is essential that the Commission examine carefully and factually each one of these conditions, probing the realities behind them and taking stock of our national needs and resources, human, and material. We should then be able to determine what kinds of actions and what sorts of policies on the part of Government, management, and labor, will restore the coal industry to economic health and provide a stable environment for constructive relationships between the operators and their employees.

This is the real challenge of the present situation. It is a test of our ability to find a way to achieve adequate production of a raw material basic to our national life, while preserving the fundamental values of our free institutions. Both our friends and our detractors in the rest of the world are watching to see how our democratic society will meet this challenge.

The coal industry is a sick industry. Temporary seizure by the Government, though it may be necessary under present circumstances, cannot produce a cure. I am recommending seizure authority because I believe we now have no alternative. But I urge that it be accompanied by a positive and constructive effort to get at the root of the trouble. This is in the interest of the men who work the mines. It is equally in the interest of their employers. Above all, it is in the interest of the American people.

I urge the Congress, therefore, to act immediately on legislation to authorize the Government to take possession of and operate the mines, and then to turn its attention to legislation looking toward a solution of the basic difficulties of the coal industry.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 3, 1950.*

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 331, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

With reference to that amendment, I have no feeling one way or the other, but the amendment was proposed in the committee and the committee voted not to include it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it the considered judgment of the chairman of the committee that the new State of Alaska can carry on the function of a State with only 12 percent of the land allocated to her as a State?

Mr. PETERSON. Primarily, we are concerned with what we have done for other States. Whether we should do more than that would be for the Congress to determine.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There were several States that came in which got all of their land. None of it was retained by the Federal Government. Now we have the Interior Department, which will strangle the new State of Alaska by retaining control of all but 12 percent of the land.

Mr. PETERSON. I agree with the gentleman that much of the land should pass into private ownership. But permit me to state that the only States which retained their public land were the Republic, later the State of Texas, and the Original Thirteen Colonies. Personally, I do not care one way or the other.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have had a number of letters from people in Alaska indicating that the citizens there thought that when they came in as a new State they would get all of the land. In fact, they would not have voted for Statehood if they had understood we were only going to allow them to have 12 percent of their land.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the distinguished Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I have a very sympathetic interest in the amendment which he proposes. Actually, Alaska would like to get half of the public land. I was in Alaska last summer and no one talked to me about this particular provision in the statehood bill. As the gentleman knows, there were strong representations made that the executive branch of Government would

oppose this provision strongly. Therefore, because I thought the new State could subsist on four sections, I agreed to go along with that provision.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman this question: Does not the language in the bill, as the committee has reported it, treat Alaska just like other western States when they were taken in?

Mr. BARTLETT. The language of the bill treats Alaska as the last three Territories admitted were treated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, I take exception to that. All of the land was given to the State of Nebraska, and the State itself put that land out to homestead.

Mr. BARTLETT. I said the last three western States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That may be true of the last three, but it is the general history of the admission of western States that when they came in they had all the land to use for homestead purposes. That is one reason why the States grew and prospered, and their population increased.

Mr. ANGELL. When the State of Oregon was admitted in 1859, she had only two sections of land, 16 and 36. We have got along fairly well, we have increased our population rapidly, more so than any State in the Union since the war.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman from Nebraska remembers, I am sure, the great celebration in his own State of the first homestead patent obtained under the homestead patent law. That was in his State of Nebraska. Was it held by the State of Nebraska or by the Federal Government?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; the State held it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Was not the celebration of the signing of that famous homestead in the gentleman's State a Federal celebration?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; it was a State celebration.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the Delegate from Alaska whether he wants the people of Alaska to administer the land of their own State?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think we ought to have a part of it and I think the Federal Government ought to retain a part to use for future settlement.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 6

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week, in view of the fact that a very considerable number of Members are here and many questions have arisen in their minds as to the program, particularly in view of the message that was just received from the White House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should be very glad to announce the program for next week at this time.

Monday: This is Consent Calendar day. There is strong probability that mine-seizure legislation may come up under suspension. I have received information that the Senate committee might meet this afternoon to consider legislation, and that the Senate might meet tomorrow. I do not want any inference to be drawn that I know what will happen for I do not; but the information I have received is that the other body is going to try to give it immediate consideration. Monday, of course, being Consent Calendar day is the only day that legislation could be considered under a suspension of the rules, and such a measure could not come up for 2 weeks unless by unanimous consent or by a rule from the Committee on Rules. So the probability is that that legislation may be considered on Monday, and I use the word "probability" because that is the strongest that I can use at the present time.

Then there will be the Hawaiian statehood bill, assuming, of course, that the Alaskan bill passes. That will be the next order of business under the rules of the House.

Tuesday: Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and we will call up for consideration the conference report on the bill H. R. 4406, the Yugoslavia claims bill. The conference report is ready also on the oleomargarine bill, and on H. R. 87, the postal service military bill.

Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday we will consider the following bills: H. R. 3105, dealing with vocational education in the Virgin Islands; H. R. 874, the library service demonstration bill; and H. R. 7058, amending the laws relating to the United States Military and Naval Academies.

Any further program will be announced later. If there is any change, it will be announced as early as possible to advise the leadership on the other side of the House. Conference reports, of course, other than those I have mentioned, are in order for consideration at any time. These announcements are always made as early as possible for the benefit of the leadership of the House as well as the membership.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that it is the purpose of the majority leader to adjourn over to Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; it is my purpose to ask that when we adjourn today we adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Do I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to mean that if the Alaska statehood bill does not pass that the Hawaiian statehood bill will not come before the House? Why, I prefer to proceed upon the assumption that the House is going to pass the Alaska statehood bill.

In the event it does not pass the Alaska statehood bill, what then?

Mr. PETERSON. We do not want to assume that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am asking the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would prefer not to cross that bridge at the present time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It might make some difference as to votes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not mean that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would consider it as holding a club over us—either pass the Alaskan bill or the Hawaiian bill is not to be considered.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has diligently kept an agreement that he made, and the House has been very kind and has enabled me to do it. I am keeping my agreements.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman always does.

Mr. McCORMACK. No matter how uncomfortable or embarrassing it might be. We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman does not want to state whether the Hawaii statehood bill will come up if the Alaska statehood bill is defeated?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have every confidence that the majority of the House will pass the Alaska bill. The gentleman heard my speech today in which my position was very clearly stated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman realizes he has not answered the question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts has not answered the question, I state that frankly, because I have not come to that bridge as yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I shall oppose Alaska statehood, even though I have a warm personal friendship with Delegate BARTLETT and others. One of the things that particularly interested me during debate on this measure was the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] when he said that war with Russia is inevitable. Now, I hope and pray that war with Russia or any other country is not inevitable and the United States will never engage in another war with any country. Certainly irresponsible statements of that kind made on the floor of this House will not prevent war but will lead to war.

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

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think possibly I was repeating the words of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] who has made that remark on several occasions. My remarks, may I say, were contingent upon whether we stop these warmongers who are traveling all over the world, in our country as well as in other parts of the world.

Mr. HUBER. I hope that no committee chairman or any Member of the House will ever again get up on the floor

and make the statement that war is inevitable. Certainly if we say it is inevitable it is bound to happen. Thought is persuasion.

I cannot see why we should go thousands of miles to Alaska and worry about statehood for those good Americans when we leave hundreds of thousands of good Americans right in our own back yard, in the District of Columbia, without the right of franchise. I think we ought to start at home before we begin somewhere else.

I am also concerned about the minerals and other valuable deposits in Alaska and whether it might be again like the tideland oil situation in California and Texas. I believe these deposits should be held in trust for the American people.

Referring to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I do not agree with him on a great many occasions, but if the majority leader is going to muzzle him, I wonder how he can muzzle the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and a few other chairmen of committees.

Why should we not be concerned more with the citizens of the District of Columbia and give them all the rights of citizenship. If we are going to do it, let us do it in the District of Columbia; let us do it right here at home. Let us not continue to disenfranchise these people in the American Capital, and at the same time grant statehood to other remote sections.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment points up one of the weaknesses in this bill. In other words, there is not enough taxable property in the Territory of Alaska so that they can raise enough money to operate a State government. Let us think what we are doing here. I want to emphasize, like my colleague from New York did, that when we once take this step we cannot rescind it. Here we have a proposed State that from one end to the other is as far as from here to Los Angeles, or as far as from here to Seattle. The total value of assessable property in Alaska, according to Moody's 1950 Government Municipals Book on this problem, is $110,000,000. It must be obvious to anybody who will think that that is not enough of a basis to conduct a State government, in an area as expansive and as diversified as Alaska is.

I am confident that if we grant statehood to Alaska they will be back in 5 years and ask the Federal Government to subsidize their State government.

Now, I want to make another point, and that is this: As far as I am concerned, I am passing on this bill as the facts are today, not on the hopes for the future. Today there are only 22,309 voters in that area. It was said here several times by various speakers that we have had this debate or one like it many times in the historic past. We have not had a situation that compares to this, and I make that statement advisedly. For every Alaskan voter there are 1,582 people in the United States. That small a proportion of people asking for statehood never occurred in any other case in United States history. The nearest to it was when Wyoming came in. That ratio was 1 to 1,006. Most of them were down way below a ratio of 1 to 265, as between the population of the Territory under consideration and the Union. Here we are giving this small group containing only 22,309 voters the greatest power we ever gave to a proportionate group in the history of the United States. You all know the serious implications that could have in a treaty proposal and in many other situations.

I have tried to emphasize, as others have, and I think everybody in the room must know it, that we have no animus toward Alaska or its people or its Delegate. I want to see them come into the Union when they prove that they are big enough and strong enough to run a State government.

National defense has nothing to do with statehood in Alaska. We will always defend Territories, whether incorporated or unincorporated, no matter what part of the world they are in, and we will do the same for Alaska. When Hawaii was attacked at Pearl Harbor, everyone said "We have been attacked." I emphasize "we." Whether they have a State government or local government would not add one iota to the defense to what we, who have the responsibility of appropriating the money, will give to Alaska. An attack on Alaska is an attack on the United States.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If statehood will bring so many blessings to Alaska, is it not rather strange that 40 percent of the Alaskans are not willing to accept statehood?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is a very good point, a point that we should emphasize. We would certainly force down the throats of 40 percent of the population something that they do not want, especially when they have not enough population, considering the great area they have to administer, to run a State government. To get the statehood asked for Alaska's people should have more unity on the issue than the plebiscite showed. I believe honestly that that small tax base is entirely too small to support a State government.

Let us try to decide this matter on the basis of what is best for the United States of America, what is best for us and for Alaska. I am confident that, if you approach it from that point of view and eliminate politics of every kind and sit down by yourself, you will realize that Alaska is not yet today fit for statehood. That is the way I hope you will vote.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman believes in democratic procedures, does he not?

Mr. JOHNSON. Of course. What does that have to do with this?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is talking about the fact that 40 percent of the people are against statehood.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let me point out to the gentleman that one voter in Alaska has 180 times as much influence as one voter in California. That clearly is an undemocratic situation. When a small group of 95,000 people can nullify the influence of 10,000,000 people—California's population—that certainly cannot be described as a democratic process. It is whittling away representative government to the extent that States—if Alaska comes in—with 5 percent of the national population could nullify a treaty which all the other States might want. Do not try to tell me that is a democratic process. It might be a Democratic—Party—process.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I make on this bill this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that events during the past 30 minutes have done much to discount the idea that the Taft-Hartley law is the slave-labor law which it has been espoused to be. If the Taft-Hartley law were a slave-labor law the miners—thank God they are not—would be in the mines chained to their machines. However, it so happens that they could not even get a contempt citation under the Taft-Hartley law. The President has now asked for a seizure bill. It seems to me that is the most potent argument for repealing the Taft-Hartley Act, not because it is a slave-labor law but because it is so ineffective that at a time when the health, safety, and welfare of the United States is at stake this law will not work to get one lump of coal out of the ground. This incident should stop all talk about the Taft-Hartley Act being a slave-labor law. In a time of crisis it was ineffective. Some argue that if it had been enforced sooner it would have proved effective. In my opinion it would work any time, late or early, if it were effective.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee gave long and serious consideration to the amount of land which should be granted to Alaska under this statehood bill. It was certainly the judgment of the committee by a majority that the sections stated in the bill would be ample and sufficient for the new State. Therefore, I shall not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. At some future time, if the Congress and the people of Alaska find that the language should be changed, provision can be made for additional acreage, which no doubt will be made.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address some remarks specifically to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. He has argued the great disproportion in the number of voters in Alaska as compared with the United States. At the same time he would leave the thought in the minds of the listeners that he is in favor of statehood at some future time.

The speciousness of his argument is the fact that the population of the

United States continually moves on very rapidly. The longer you delay statehood the more facts he would have to support his argument. I think that is conclusive evidence that he is fundamentally opposed to statehood for Alaska, which is certainly his privilege just as it is mine to be in favor of statehood.

The gentleman from North Carolina pointed out that 40 percent of the people of Alaska were opposed to statehood, or something to that effect. I should like to have him submit figures to show that 40 percent of the population of Alaska are opposed to statehood. That is just some more of this argument that is thrown in here as sheer wind, you might say.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Alaska can give us that information.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am asking the gentleman about his statement that 40 percent of the population of Alaska oppose statehood.

Mr. COOLEY. Forty percent of those voting in the election.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is not what I am talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman agree that 40 percent of those who went to the ballot box and voted did vote against this proposition?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is not what I am talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am talking about the total population of Alaska.

It ties in with another specious argument made this afternoon where it was said that Alaska supplied only so many hundred people, a few hundred people, under selective service. Those who claim to be informed on the defenses of this country had better keep in mind the most extraordinary valuable defense services rendered to the people of the United States by the Aleuts and the Eskimos of Alaska during the war, who were the smartest fellows that we have on our defense lines anywhere under the American flag. You did not play any marches for them. They are the boys who know what happens up and down those cold waters between Alaska and Russia. They are the boys who pass the word back to the so-called big brass. But you did not say anything about the contribution those fellows made in your remarks with respect to the few people who were put into the selective service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is another case where we are trying to drive something down the throats of a lot of people who do not seem to want legislation of this kind. You and I know that we are interested in Alaska. We want to take care of Alaska. But if we leave all the land, except 12 percent, in the hands of the Department of the Interior, then that Department is going to run Alaska, and you can just count on that. The people of Alaska are not going to have very much to say on what they do if they ever get to become a State.

The Interior Department would have such influence on the people, and if, as was said, 40 percent of them do not want the Federal Government to grant them statehood, it seems to me you are doing wrong by going ahead and passing this bill today. This country is in danger. It is in terrible danger when the President of the United States comes, as he did via his message 15 minutes ago, and asks us to seize the coal mines of the country.

How soon is it going to be when he is going to ask you to seize the railroads and ask you to seize the telephone companies? You are going into socialism when you get to that point. Then you will have the President of the United States dealing with all these conditions which we are facing. That is just what Hitler did a few years ago. Look what happened to Germany.

Are you going to start doing the same thing here? It looks that way to me. I do not want any part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman the answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is that in this bill, passed out of our committee, there are four sections in every township reserved to Alaska. That is two more sections than were reserved to the Western States. In the State of Idaho, sections 16 and 36 out of every township were reserved for schools. Alaska gets two more. They get four out of every township.

I want to say to the committee that Alaska, Finland, Norway, and Sweden are in the same latitude, almost the same kind of country, with the same kind of climate.

Many years ago, before this issue ever came up, I read where the Department of Agriculture had investigated conditions in Alaska and had reported that it was just as capable of supporting a population and industries as Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. I am wondering if this opposition to statehood for Alaska would be in favor of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark being territories of the Russian Empire. They are great countries. They are an inspiration to the rest of the world with their liberal laws and their independence. Why not give Alaska statehood and let her work out her destiny. There is everything in Alaska to make a great State. Let us use it. Let us vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is rather painful to me to have to resist the eloquent arguments which are made for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. I have a very high regard for both the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON], and I hope that if these two Territories become States they will both go to the Senate.

I took a trip through Alaska in 1944. I flew up the inside passage, through Edmonton, most of the way following the Alcan Highway to Fairbanks. From Fairbanks to Nome, and from Nome up the coast to Anchorage, and then from Anchorage down to Juneau and back the outside route. I do not pretend to be an expert on Alaska, but I did see a great deal of it.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is of great interest to me, because it means the allocation of the land they have up there.

When you see that country, the really fruitful part of it is along the west coast. That which is inland is subject to the terrific winter temperatures of 60 and 70 below zero in the wintertime. Some of it is impassable as far as getting the timber out, because of muskeg and other conditions. A vast area of Alaska is mountainous and a wilderness practically incapable of useful production.

I am wondering how Alaska, if it ever became a State, is ever going to finance itself. No matter if you double the amount of land which is to go to Alaska under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], I think it would be perfectly impossible, for it to be self-supporting.

Fundamentally, I am opposed to these bills, because I cannot get over the difficulty which I have of territory outside the limits of the United States, being transferred to statehood. I think the moment we do that we involve ourselves in a number of questions that have been developed today. I wish I could get over that handicap. Perhaps I am wrong in my thinking, but the way I feel, with all of the other problems which we have to face in this country, to take on the additional problems, which, if you pass this bill, you are going to have to take on, I think is more than we should be asked to do under the present world conditions today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. I was unable to complete my statement when I addressed you a few minutes ago making a comparison between the war machines of the United States and Russia. I pointed out what a terrific difference there was between the armament programs of the two countries. I am just wondering what the members of this Committee think Russia is building this tremendous war machine for. Their intentions certainly cannot be assumed to be peaceful. How defenseless Alaska was during the last war is indicated by statements made to our committee by the citizens of Nome who told us that when the Japanese occupied the Aleutians they fled to the hills, and all that they had to defend themselves and their families was shark spears and shotguns. Fortunately, the Japs did not advance further north.

I also stated that there were other issues in this matter which had not been pointed out. Since then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] mentioned one of them. But there are others to which I wish to refer. The first refers to the obligations and precedents set when

Alaska and Hawaii and other Territories were voted statehood. I was a member of both of the committees which held extensive hearings and studied this question, and besides examining the situation on the ground I read the hearings and debate both in the Senate and House on the legislation admitting both these areas as Territories of the United States. Every question was covered at the time they were granted Territorial status, including the question of their right eventually to enter the Union as States, and it was admitted and understood that by giving them the status of Territories there was an obligation and precedents which established the obligation, precedent, right, and expectancy that both would be admitted to the Union when they met the requirements.

Another issue involved is that of taxation without representation, the same issue that caused the conflict of the war between this country and England. While it is admitted that both Territories have Delegates in the Congress, they do not have any vote.

The report of the committee, in my opinion, shows that the Territory of Alaska certainly is in a position in every way, economically and otherwise, to assume statehood.

Both of these Territories pay tremendous amounts of taxes into our Federal Treasury, just as other States, and, as a matter of fact, Hawaii has paid, since 1900, income taxes more than a billion dollars.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is that raised by some Members with regard to the apportionment of the membership in the House of Representatives. Some Members were afraid their States would lose the memberships that would be assigned to these Territories when admitted as States. I remind these gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, that there have been a number of reapportionments of this House. The membership has been increased from time to time. As a matter of fact, there is a forced redistribution of the membership due to changes in population. We all know that as a result of the census to be taken this year changes will be made in State representations in the Congress, especially in the cases of California and some of the other States. California will gain nine seats in the House of Representatives, and others will lose and gain membership, and certainly with the increased population of the United States, regardless of the admission of Alaska and Hawaii, there will be a reapportionment in the House of Representatives, and when Alaska and Hawaii are admitted into the Union this matter will be taken care of as it has in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that even in the last war Alaska played an important part in the winning of the war. Its airfields and location was of strategic value. One of the best breaks we had was that just before the war there had been established a weather-reporting station at Juneau, and as a result thousands of lives of Americans were saved and our success, in the Pacific was due to this station being able to report the weather for our naval operations in the entire Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, with the completion of the Alcan Highway to Alaska I predict a tourist trade to Alaska comparable to that of California and Yellowstone Park amounting to millions of dollars. Very few of our citizens have seen Alaska, and when this highway is opened it will contribute to thousands migrating there, and the tourist trade will add to the income and economy of Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, in order to give the Members of the House an insight of the importance, economy, scenic beauty, resources, and other facts about Alaska, I wish to read from a letter addressed to me by Mr. Baker, publisher of the Gazette, in Wrangell, Alaska. I quote:

The Territory of Alaska, which is 2½ times the size of Texas and stretches across the one hundred and eightieth meridian into the Old World, is America's last frontier.

Alaska, while admittedly still a land of enchanting scenery, of high, snow-capped mountains, Indian-made totem poles, and vast glaciers—one of them bigger than the State of Rhode Island—also is suprisingly modern. Alaskans tell us they have more refrigerators, radios, books, magazines, and other material things of life than the average citizens of the 48 States. They have more air lines too, because the plane is the accepted way of getting around in a hurry where islands make highways impossible, and steamers stop in only once or twice a week.

Petersburg, a Norwegian fishing community just south of Juneau, claims the highest per capita wealth under the American flag. Its population of 1,200 consists mostly of fishermen with a few fur farmers. But a halibut fisherman or even a salmon troller who doesn't make from $5,000 to $10,000 in a year's time is disappointed with himself. Hence Petersburg's banker, Ed Lokken, told us his nearly $2,000,000 in deposits made his per capita wealth the highest in America.

Alaska's economy is, however, admittedly one-sided, devoted to fishing and gold mining with trapping and tourist trade next in importance. In the four cities and towns, citizens have declared that the way to make jobs for returning GI's and newcomers who have read much of Alaska since the bombing of Dutch Harbor and the Battle of Attu is to open up the forests and develop the two dozen or more known species of fish of commercial value that aren't being harvested at present. Also, Commissioner B. D. Stewart of the Alaska department of mines gave us recently published booklets on metallic and nonmetallic minerals that show a vast field of possible development in marbles, clays, limestones, granites and similar products. Even the sawing of logs for log-cabin-type homes, of which Alaska has many, would seem to offer many jobs.

Southeastern Alaska is nearly all national forest land while much of the mainland or interior is public domain, good for grazing reindeer, dredging of gold and lumbering where there is timber. Out in the Aleutian Islands, where the Government recently returned the Aleuts, America's only war refugees, from temporary camps near Juneau, the chief occupations are fishing and fur farming. The natives, only about 1,100 in number all told, live a subsistence type of existence although fox fur farming and sheep grazing show some promise. The Aleutians, of course, extend to within 650 miles of Japan's Kurile Islands and house some big army and navy bases since the Japanese tried to seize Aleutian bases early in the war.

Alaska is interesting to visit in many ways. Its Matanuska Valley, where Uncle Sam has a farm colony, now is apparently out of the experimental stage and some farmers grow 15 to 20 tons of potatoes per acre on the best sandy loam soil. War prices bring them up to $98 per ton and 7 to 7½ cents per pound for the new crop which is dug by mid-July. Like any other place, Alaska farming demands hard work, much building up of soil and constant experimentation to adapt crops to the short growing season. Even rainy southeastern Alaska has some successful farmers producing garden stuffs, berries, poultry, rabbits and dairy products.

Alaska is the scene of many interesting developments. Major airlines are fighting for permits to fly through Alaska to Siberia, China, Japan, India and the Netherlands East Indies. Some day soon it may be possible to fly around the rim of the Pacific through the Orient, Australia, New Zealand, South America and back to the States. Several lines already cover inland Alaska.

The Navy is drilling for oil in a vast area of the oil seepages where the Eskimos live along the Arctic Sea. Several paper companies, newspapers and magazines are studying pulpwood prospects in southeastern Alaska where the regional forester says there is enough spruce and hemlock to supply one-fifth of America's prewar needs on a perpetual yield basis. Several mining companies have field engineers in Alaska getting ready to resume gold mining or open up in new products, some of which have been made profitable by war prices or war-caused shortages.

The Territories committee has heard many appeals both for statehood in the near future for Alaska and for liberalization of the organic act which limits Alaska's legislature to certain local matters. They also want to elect their governor in the near future. There are problems of finances to be worked out but Alaskans seem ready to get to work on these matters. They have set up a development board to help bring new settlers and new industries to Alaska. Its office is in Juneau.

Alaskans are friendly to meet. They like to take you trout and grayling fishing, to show you the scenery and to discuss their problems. Most of them say that if granted statehood, Alaska can grow rapidly and absorb thousands of newcomers. But considerable study and research may be needed before the vast wealth of Alaska can be unlocked for the benefit of the entire Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the defense of Alaska. I hope, regardless of whether this area remains a territory or becomes a State, that we will defend Alaska. I would remind my colleagues, however, that the Governor of Alaska, Mr. Gruening, within the last few months made the statement that Russia could take Alaska with just a few airborne divisions. If we admitted Alaska as a State, it would be far more embarrassing to give up a State than it would be to give up a Territory. I do not believe that this is going to happen under any circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I am very serious about this amendment. I am trying to give Alaska at least 50 percent of the land in order that she may conduct herself as a new State. The bill would give her about 12 percent of the land. I just do not believe that a new State can grow and prosper without sufficient land areas in which to do so. We all know that growth and wealth come from the soil. Our committee reported in 1945 that there were some 80,000,000,000 board-feet of lumber in Alaska that could be

removed. I want to see the new State prosper through the processes of homesteading, development of land, and getting access to the water line, which they do not now have. Under Interior Department rule, it is almost impossible for any settler to get to the water line. I believe this amendment of mine would cure that. It would give the new State enough to exist on so that it could grow and prosper and it would not have to come to the United States for help every year.

Outside of the last three States that came into the Union, all of the States did have their land granted to them so that they could develop and grow as homestead States. That is one reason why those States in our country became great.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not the view of the gentleman, who has been up to Alaska, that it is so big the ordinary cost of a State government would be higher in Alaska than anywhere else?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, yes. The cost would be much higher. It is about one-fifth the size of the United States. Most of the good land up there is along the southwestern coast, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JOHNSON. So that you would have to have more property on which to assess taxes?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; and they must have more land or they cannot exist as a State. It is a hollow mockery to say, "We will make you a State, but we will give you only about 12 percent of the land to exist on." I think that is wrong. I think we ought to give them at least half of the land, and that is what my amendment proposes to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, you have heard the debate more or less in detail. With reference to the particular amendment now before us, as I stated before, I do not feel keenly one way or the other about it. The amendment was offered in committee and the committee voted it down. It is a different rule from what was generally in effect when other States were admitted into the Union.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I merely rise to ask what is the estimated revenue that the State of Alaska would get from its tax values? Or what are the tax values?

Mr. PETERSON. We have that in the RECORD.

Mr. BONNER. That is a very important question, whether the State would be able to sustain itself.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; the State will be able to sustain itself.

Mr. BONNER. Well, what is the estimated taxable property that the State would be able to tax? Is it not true it has been stated that it is about $100,000?

Mr. PETERSON. No, it runs more than that. The Delegate from Alaska will give us the figures.

Mr. BONNER. That is a very important question.

Mr. BARTLETT. While a figure was quoted a while ago, that related only to municipalities.

Mr. BONNER. We do not want to create a pauper State and that is evidently what you are doing because the State would not get sufficient taxes.

Mr. PETERSON. Five million seven hundred fifty-three thousand five hundred and twenty-eight dollars.

Mr. BONNER. Five million dollars. Now what tax would you raise on $5,000,000?

Mr. PETERSON. It is set forth in the RECORD and in the report clearly that they could step up the amount which the Territory is now raising and there is the further statement that the income tax would pay a great portion of it. Income taxes are paid on the processing that occurs in the United States on the fish pack, lumber, and so forth.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman from Florida is a very intelligent man. Now basically we have got to get down to facts. What in the world would you be able to raise in revenue on $5,000,000 worth of valuation? You could not run the State government.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the Territory of Alaska now has a gross production annually of over $200,000,000. From that production, taxes to support the State would be raised. It is done everywhere else, of course. The last legislature appropriated about a million dollars. A State government would not be so costly there because we do not have to duplicate the uneconomic units that have been started and cannot be stopped.

Mr. BONNER. The State of Alaska would be kept in step with the other States.

Mr. BARTLETT. We do not have to have a lot of small and expensive counties and we can avoid other mistakes that have been made.

Mr. PETERSON. They can step up the taxes to support the government.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The hearings which were held all over the Territory show from the mouth of the people who will pay these taxes that they have ample resources there, that they are ready to tax themselves whatever is necessary to pay the State budget and they even go so far as to claim they are sufficiently intelligent to design the type of government which they can themselves finance.

Thank God we still have people in the world who take that attitude. May I add, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] stood here and argued, if you please, that we should withhold full citizenship from the people of Alaska and Hawaii; that we should not permit them, for instance, to elect their Governors; that they should be taxed without representative votes in the House and the Senate of the United States. That is 1812 stuff; it is no good. It is not in keeping with the principles of this Government at the present time. It defies the fact that we fought two world wars to extend rights to the little people, and for me I certainly will never follow that course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 30, noes 58.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, pursuant to House Resolution 217, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON) there were—ayes 87, noes 67.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 146, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—186

Addonizio	Carnahan	Forand
Albert	Case, S. Dak.	Ford
Allen, Calif.	Chelf	Fugate
Anderson, Calif.	Chesney	Fulton
Angell	Christopher	Furcolo
Aspinall	Cole, Kans.	Garmatz
Bailey	Combs	Gordon
Baring	Corbett	Gorski
Barrett, Wyo.	Crawford	Granger
Bates, Ky.	Crook	Gross
Beckworth	Crosser	Hagen
Biemiller	Cunningham	Hall,
Boggs, La.	Davenport	Edwin Arthur
Bolling	Davis, Ga.	Havenner
Bosone	D'Ewart	Hays, Ohio
Bramblett	Dingell	Herlong
Breen	Dolliver	Heselton
Bryson	Eberharter	Hinshaw
Buchanan	Elliott	Holifield
Buckley, Ill.	Elston	Holmes
Burdick	Engle, Calif.	Hope
Burke	Evins	Horan
Burnside	Fallon	Howell
Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan	Irving
Camp	Fernandez	Jackson, Wash.
Canfield	Flood	Javits

Jenison	Miles	Sasscer
Jensen	Miller, Calif.	Saylor
Karst	Mitchell	Scudder
Karsten	Morris	Secrest
Kearney	Morton	Shelley
Kearns	Multer	Sikes
Kee	Murdock	Simpson, Ill.
Keefe	Murphy	Sims
Kennedy	Murray, Wis.	Spence
Kerr	Nixon	Staggers
King	Norblad	Stigler
Kirwan	Norton	Stockman
Kruse	O'Brien, Ill.	Sullivan
Lane	O'Brien, Mich.	Talle
Lanham	O'Hara, Ill.	Tauriello
Larcade	O'Konski	Thompson
LeCompte	O'Neill	Tollefson
LeFevre	O'Sullivan	Underwood
Lemke	O'Toole	Velde
Lind	Passman	Vorys
Linehan	Patman	Wagner
Lovre	Perkins	Walsh
McCarthy	Peterson	Welch
McCormack	Phillips, Tenn.	Werdel
McDonough	Polk	White, Calif.
McGuire	Poulson	White, Idaho
McKinnon	Price	Wickersham
McSweeney	Priest	Wier
Mack, Wash.	Rabaut	Willis
Madden	Rees	Wilson, Okla.
Magee	Ribicoff	Withrow
Mansfield	Rodino	Woodhouse
Marsalis	Rogers, Fla.	Yates
Marshall	Rogers, Mass.	Young
Martin, Iowa	Rooney	Zablocki
Merrow	Sabath	
Meyer	Sanborn	

NAYS—146

Abernethy	Goodwin	O'Hara, Minn.
Allen, Ill.	Gore	Pace
Andersen, H. Carl	Gossett	Patterson
	Graham	Philbin
Andresen, August H.	Grant	Phillips, Calif.
	Hale	Pickett
Andrews	Halleck	Poage
Arends	Hand	Potter
Barden	Harden	Preston
Bates, Mass.	Hardy	Rains
Battle	Hare	Rankin
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Harrison	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Ohio	Harvey	Rich
Bonner	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Boykin	Hill	Riehlman
Brehm	Hobbs	Sadlak
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Scrivner
Burleson	Huber	Shafer
Cannon	Hull	Short
Carlyle	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Chiperfield	Jennings	Smith, Kans.
Church	Johnson	Smith, Va.
Clevenger	Jonas	Smith, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Ala.	Stanley
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Steed
Cooley	Jones, N. C.	Stefan
Cooper	Kean	Sutton
Cotton	Keating	Taber
Cox	Kilburn	Tackett
Curtis	Kilday	Teague
Dague	Lodge	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Thornberry
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Trimble
DeGraffenried	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Delaney	McGregor	Weichel
Dondero	McMillan, S. C.	Wheeler
Donohue	McMillen, Ill.	Whitten
Doughton	Mahon	Whittington
Engel, Mich.	Mason	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Michener	Williams
Fenton	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Frazier	Mills	Wolcott
Gamble	Monroney	Wolverton
Gathings	Murray, Tenn.	Wood
Gavin	Nelson	Woodruff
Gillette	Nicholson	
Golden	Norrell	

NOT VOTING—100

Abbitt	Bulwinkle	Deane
Allen, La.	Burton	Denton
Auchincloss	Byrne, N. Y.	Dollinger
Barrett, Pa.	Carroll	Douglas
Beall	Case, N. J.	Doyle
Bennett, Fla.	Cavalcante	Durham
Bentsen	Celler	Eaton
Blackney	Chatham	Ellsworth
Blatnik	Chudoff	Fogarty
Boggs, Del.	Clemente	Gary
Bolton, Md.	Coudert	Gilmer
Brooks	Davies, N. Y.	Granahan
Buckley, N. Y	Dawson	Green
Gregory	Leonard W.	Regan
Gwinn	Lyle	Rhodes
Hall,	Lynch	Rivers
Hart	McGrath	Roosevelt
Hébert	Mack, Ill.	Sadowski
Hedrick	Macy	Scott, Hardie
Heffernan	Marcantonio	Scott,
Heller	Martin, Mass.	Hugh D., Jr.
Herter	Morgan	Sheppard
Hoffman, Ill.	Morrison	Smathers
Jackson, Calif.	Moulder	Smith, Ohio
Jacobs	Noland	Taylor
James	Patten	Towe
Judd	Pfeifer,	Vinson
Kelley, Pa.	Joseph L.	Vursell
Kelly, N. Y.	Pfeiffer,	Wadsworth
Keogh	William L.	Walter
Klein	Plumley	Whitaker
Kunkel	Powell	Widnall
Latham	Quinn	Wilson, Tex.
Lesinski	Ramsay	Worley
Lichtenwalter	Redden	

XCVI——175

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. William L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Carroll for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Clemente against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Wilson of Texas against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Noland for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Burton against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Quinn against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Redden against.

Mr. Marcantonio for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Bulwinkle against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Beall against.

Mr. Granahan for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Chudoff for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Kunkel.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Case of New Jersey.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Green with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. McCARTHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHURCH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what can the majority leader say as to the plan for taking up the legislation proposed by the President to restore national coal production?

Mr. McCORMACK. I announced the program earlier, in which I said that it probably would be considered under suspension of the rules.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that would have to be on Monday. I cannot make a definite statement to the House. That is the strongest I can go at the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the President in his message said that this requires action at once. If it is to be taken at face value, I do not understand the reason why we should wait until Monday to consider it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I told the House that the only way the bill could be considered would be by unanimous consent. The gentleman from South Dakota knows that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman asked for unanimous consent?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday a motion to suspend the rules and pass on the bill would be in order. I stated that I had information that the Senate committee might consider it this afternoon, and if they reported it out, the Senate might consider it tomorrow. Certainly Monday is as early as anyone could reasonably expect the House to pass on the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman recalls that when the railroad strike was on a bill was presented here and driven through on the same day.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, the majority leader had information that objection would be made and he could not get unanimous consent anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. I could not say that. I will be frank. I doubt if unanimous consent could be obtained, but on Monday, anyway, a motion to suspend the rules will be in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yesterday I was conferring with the head of the Interstate Commerce Commission on this situation, the shortage of coal, and I was informed that there are many railroads today that have less than 10 days' supply of coal on hand, and that is going to have its repercussions throughout the general economy. If that is the situation, action 3 days earlier means coal 3 days earlier, if this will produce coal. I do not know that it will, but if it will, if this is the thing to do, then this ought to be done at the earliest possible time, it seems to me, and the majority leader should seek to

bring it up under unanimous consent. If he cannot, then of course the procedure he suggested about waiting until Monday would be in order. Under the circumstances, until an attempt is made tomorrow, I shall be constrained to object to going over until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am somewhat surprised at the statement of my friend. Nobody has really had an opportunity to examine the bill that has been introduced.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the bill even been printed and made available to the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the majority leader is doing everything possible for as early consideration as anybody could expect on the part of the House, when we have an opportunity to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill on Monday. If that day were 2 weeks off or 10 days off a different situation would present itself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When you are dealing with a coal strike?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly. The bill has been referred to the House committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The House committee may meet tomorrow morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. The House committee is going to meet tomorrow morning, I understand. There is going to be a Senate committee meeting. I do not know if they met this afternoon or not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly I would not want to admit that the other body could consider this legislation more quickly than we. As the gentleman has suggested, the Senate is going to take it up tomorrow, and I do not know why an attempt at least should not be made to bring it up in the House tomorrow. Until that request is made, I will object to going over to Monday.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the Alaska statehood bill.

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

There was no objection.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the committee of conference, and I do not know of any member of the committee on the minority side that has had an opportunity to examine the conference report or the statement of the conferees. I feel we should at least have the opportunity to examine the report before it is filed, because it is 10 days since the conferees apparently agreed. Until we have a chance to see the report, I will object to filing it tonight.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1008

Mr. MICHENER (on behalf of Mr. CELLER) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill S. 1008, an act to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 49, with Mr. HARDY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we want to make as much progress as we can toward statehood for Hawaii, and we thought we might utilize this time. I want to place in the RECORD certain figures for your consideration before we vote. You will have these figures available to you, so that you can analyze them and see just what the situation is.

Bear in mind the fact that the Territory of Hawaii was annexed by the United States originally as a result of a treaty. At that time Hawaii was an independent republic. The people hoped and aspired at that time to ultimately obtain statehood. They acquired Territorial status at that time and since then they have managed their financial affairs in fine shape. They paid more into the Federal Treasury in 1949 than 11 other States. They paid $90,824,693. This exceeds the amount paid by 11 States: Arizona, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

So they have grown up financially and in addition the population consists of more than half a million people. The estimated population is 533,000 as of July 1948.

In view of the fact that later on I will discuss this matter again, I shall not go into it further at this time, but I did want to show clearly in my opening remarks that this bill was reported out of the committee with only one dissenting vote which was more in the nature of a resolution than it was actually a vote against it. I sincerely hope we may pass this bill granting statehood to Hawaii by a fine vote.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and I realize that all Members are anxious to conclude these proceedings and return to their offices and homes.

But before you do so, I would like to introduce you briefly to some of the issues involved in the question of admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State.

The bill before us is almost identical with the bill passed on June 30, 1947, by a vote of 196 to 133. The only changes that have been made in it are minor, and have been made necessary by the passing of time.

There is no legislation that has come before the House in recent years that has received as extensive consideration as statehood for Hawaii. There is available to you hearings that cover more than 3,000 pages. More than 700 witnesses have been heard. Eighty or ninety Members of Congress have served on committees which have considered this issue, and something like 50 of them have visited the Territory itself to examine the problems at first-hand.

The people of the Territory of Hawaii are overwhelmingly in favor of statehood for Hawaii. A plebiscite in 1940 showed them 2 to 1 in favor of it, but a vote today would show them at least 4 or 5 to 1 in favor of statehood for Hawaii. I do not think there can be the slightest doubt about that.

In addition to that, the people of the country support the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State. A poll of public opinion taken in recent years was concluded on February 22, and it showed the people 4 to 1 in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

Every patriotic organization of any consequence in the country has come out in favor of it. The American Legion last fall went on record as favoring statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii for defense reasons. I could cite organizations in practically every field of human activity who have recorded themselves in favor of the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State.

The people of Hawaii have lived for many years in the belief that they were promised statehood for Hawaii. They have been encouraged in that belief, and they feel now they have demonstrated their qualifications for it.

I will not undertake to review what those qualifications are, as many committees have already found that we are qualified. The record supports that. I do not think there is anybody who will dispute it.

Finally, I think there can be no question that the time has come for the country to fulfill the promise of statehood for the people of Hawaii for reasons that have been very well presented to the House earlier in the day. So many of the issues involved have already been given consideration by the House that I see no point in prolonging the debate on this

question. I believe the House is thoroughly informed on the issues involved, and ready to vote.

I think you know that the population of Hawaii is well over 500,000. The arguments against Alaskan statehood on that account do not apply to Hawaii. We have been so well developed from an economic standpoint that we are able to discharge all the financial obligations of statehood. In fact, it would save the Federal Government a little money to give Hawaii statehood, in the executive and judicial branches.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I voted against statehood for Alaska, but I am particularly impressed with the argument the gentleman is now making. I feel that Hawaii is in quite a different category from Alaska, and I expect to support the gentleman in the splendid fight he has been making to have statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman.

I have nothing further to add at this time, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I favor H. R. 49. Congress must grant Hawaii and Alaska statehood—now.

The reasons are imperative.

They are key areas of our strategic defense against Russia.

They are key areas in our cold war against the world spread of communism.

As Territories they are weak.

As States they would be strong.

Japan struck at both Territories in World War II.

Hawaii and Alaska today are the prime targets under the American flag of the most powerful enemy that has ever threatened the United States.

Statehood would strengthen them internally.

And statehood would vastly strengthen America's position in the ideological and economic conflict now being waged by Russia throughout the Pacific.

Proof of that was given me on my recent tour of all our island possessions in the Pacific, Japan, the Philippines, Okinawa, Hong Kong, and other parts of the Orient.

It substantiated completely earlier impressions I had gained on visits to Alaska and other Territorial possessions.

The actions of our Government toward its Territories speak louder to the peoples of the Orient and the Pacific than all the flossy double talk emanating from our State Department.

We will be on the losing end of the cold war in the Pacific as long as we limit the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska to a mere territorial status.

Today Communists everywhere can and do make capital of these admittedly unfortunate facts:

First. Hawaii, an area with a population greater than that of 11 of our sovereign States, has no vote in Congress and no voice in the Senate of the United States.

Second. Alaska, with an area one-third as large as our entire continental United States, likewise has no vote in Congress or voice in the Senate.

Third. They are excluded from even discussions of foreign relations within the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

Fourth. Their citizens contribute richly in taxes to the Federal Treasury—without representation.

Fifth. Their people, their business enterprises, and their investments in recent years have been denied even Federal protection.

As Territories, both Hawaii and Alaska have been powerless to deal with paralyzing strikes which Harry Bridges' Pacific longshoremen's union either engineered or in which his union has been actively involved.

Bridges is now on trial in the United States District Court in San Francisco on perjury charges that he swore falsely at a naturalization hearing in 1945 that he never was a Communist.

There is voluminous testimony before that trial that he is or was a Communist and a leader among Communists.

As Territories, Hawaii and Alaska are helpless to deal with such types.

CRUCIAL ROLE

As States they could protect the interests of their citizens and their economy at least to a greater legree than they can now or have been unable to during recent strangling strikes.

Statehood is important to Hawaii and Alaska.

It is even more important to the United States that Hawaii and Alaska become States.

Theirs is a crucial role in our national destiny.

They are our western bastions of defense.

They represent to the peoples of Asia, the Orient, and the Pacific the one example of unity and equality among the three great Pacific racial groups.

In their territorial activities Hawaiians and Alaskans have long demonstrated the highest qualities of citizenship and abilities for self-government under the free American system.

Hawaii and Alaska are entitled to statehood and statehood will enable them to more effectively fill their vital role.

Consider these roles separately.

Alaska is a vast territory of very great, yet unmeasured resources.

We are spending money up there as if we intended to use Alaska as a buffer between the United States and Russia, which lies only across a narrow strip of water where the two countries almost touch.

CANNOT CONTINUE

The United States has set itself up as a buffer between Russia and the rest of the world.

Unless Alaska does serve as a strong buffer between Russia and ourselves, the United States cannot continue indefinitely as a buffer between Russia and the rest of the world.

It is as simple as that.

The United States needs Alaska as a State.

It needs Alaska much more than Alaska needs the United States.

It needs Alaska's space, her strategic geographic position, her industry, her resources, and her potential products.

We need everything Alaska has—fish, timber, minerals, oil—and everything that Alaska can develop and produce.

We need them in relation to our industrial and economic position, and in relation to the international obligations we have assumed throughout the world.

NEEDS PEOPLE

Alaska needs people, lots of people, in addition to its present population which today is larger than that of a third of our States when they were admitted to the Union.

She needs people to develop her vast resources.

Alaska needs transportation so that tonnage to build industries and defenses can move to Alaska, and the products and raw materials of Alaska can move to us.

To Alaskans this means a railroad, and it should mean the same thing to us.

A railroad is the only safe and economic method of transportation that can be provided.

Ocean transportation to Alaska has been shut off repeatedly by maritime union strikes.

POWERFUL INFLUENCE

Every strike has impaired our defense program in Alaska.

Russian submarines would menace our sea lanes in event of war.

The Alcan Highway is a dusty road that starts far north of Edmonton and is connected with closer highways only by an unimproved dirt road constantly in bad condition.

In the face of Russia's huge submarine program and her vast construction program across the Bering Straits from Alaska, a railway to Alaska is a must.

What does this have to do with statehood?

This:

Alaska needs—and we need—two Alaskans in the United States Senate who can inform us about Alaska and her needs, both economic and for defense. We need their voice, their action, and their vote.

Alaska needs—and we need—a Representative in the House who has a vote.

BENEFIT TO ALASKA

Alaska would benefit, the United States would benefit, and, I believe, our international relations in view of the obligations we have assumed to help most of the world, would benefit as well.

Hawaii is in a somewhat different position, but is just as much entitled to statehood as Alaska, although for somewhat different reasons.

Militarily, Hawaii stands at one corner of our inner Pacific defense triangle that extends from Alaska's mainland down to Hawaii and across to our Pacific coast.

Hawaii also is a pivot for our outer Pacific defense triangle that extends southward to encompass the Pacific islands now under our trusteeship, Samoa and Guam; extends westward to Okinawa, and extends north to the tip of the Aleutians.

Hawaii has almost reached the zenith of her agricultural development and resources.

LOYAL POPULATION

Her population is large and relatively stable. Her people are industrious and loyal. Hawaii is American. In every way Hawaii is the equivalent of States with similar populations—except that she is not a State.

Hawaii has met all qualifications of statehood ordinarily required by Congress and definitely should be a State.

Statehood for Hawaii would have priceless value to the United States in the Pacific and in our international relations with the world.

Only in Hawaii have the cultures of the Orient, of Micronesia and Polynesia, become completely absorbed within the American concept of human dignity and government under law.

The mere knowledge that Hawaii has been granted statehood would have dynamic effect throughout Oceania and the Orient.

It would be the greatest blow to Stalin and communism in the Orient that America could deliver, for it would prove this:

Where Russia can only offer slavery, starvation, and loss of face, the United States has offered to a population that includes their racial strains full partnership as a State.

Let us achieve this victory in the cold war in the Pacific now.

Make Hawaii a State.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, not too often do I come to the well of this House to speak for or against proposed legislation, but to me the bill under consideration, which has for its purpose statehood for Hawaii, is one of merit. Therefore, it is a privilege for me to support H. R. 49.

Unless I have been misinformed—and I do not believe that I have been—there is no sound reason or logic why Hawaii should not be granted statehood. It would appear to me the plain truth is that, through neglect, the Congress of the United States is guilty of imposing taxation without representation on half a million American citizens, the people of Hawaii.

In considering the bill before us, if we were to consider only facts, in all probability this bill would have the unanimous support of this body. It is my understanding that Hawaiian status has never been that of a colony or a possession; instead its people have always understood that, when qualified, they were to be accorded the privileges of statehood. They feel that on the basis of their accomplishments their period of apprenticeship should have been terminated years ago. It has been directed to my attention that Hawaii was neither purchased from a foreign government nor was it a prize of war. In 1897, then an independent republic, Hawaii voluntarily offered itself for annexation to the United States in much the same manner as did the Republic of Texas in 1845. Thus, in 1898, by resolutions of Congresses of this country and Hawaii, the island republic became an integral part of the United States.

I think it would be well for us to consider Hawaii's war record. No doubt many of you in pondering this question will recall to mind the stories about sabotage which came to us over the air and through the press that fateful Sunday in December 1941. We heard that Japanese laborers had cut huge arrows in the cane fields, pointing the direction of Pearl Harbor. You will recall another story to the effect that other saboteurs drove trucks upon the runways of our military airfields and wrecked them, thereby preventing our fighter planes from taking off to repel the invader.

These are but two of the many stories given wide circulation on and immediately after December 7, 1941. How many of them were true? Well, the government departments in charge of our Nation's safety who should know are the Army, Navy, and the FBI. All three, through their spokesmen, in reporting to Congress on these stories stated that neither before, during, nor after the attack on Pearl Harbor was there any evidence of a single act of sabotage in Hawaii. Instead of their loyalty being open to question, it would probably be more accurate to say that nowhere did Americans labor as hard to win the war—and under more difficult circumstances than did our citizens in Hawaii. Moreover, the people of Hawaii bought more war bonds, per capita, than did the people of any of the 48 mainland States.

Those who were inclined to be dubious about the loyalty of part of our Hawaiian citizens invariably have in mind that segment of 32 percent of the Islands' population which is of Japanese extraction. Perhaps the best single index of the loyalty of our Americans of Japanese parentage lies in the fact that although they represent 32 percent of the population, due to their large number of volunteers, their racial group supplied 52 percent of Hawaii's World War II fighting men.

It is difficult to grasp—even from this astounding fact—the full measure of the devotion of these men. For it should be borne in mind that because of their racial background, they were looked upon with suspicion and were subjected to uncalled for abuse and indignities. The Navy, for example—in which I was privileged to serve—refused to accept them even as volunteers.

And what sort of soldiers did they make? About 13,000 of them bore arms in World War II and the bulk of these men were assigned to the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Combat Team. Except for some top officers, both of these outfits were composed entirely of Americans of Japanese ancestry, and their exploits make up one of the most glorious chapters in America's military history.

In the entire course of the Italian and European campaigns these men did not give up so much as one yard—only two of them were captured by the enemy, and then only after both men had been severely wounded. For their courage and accomplishments these superb fighting men came out of the war the most highly decorated unit in the history of the United States Army. They were awarded:

Five Presidential unit citations;

Fifty Army commendations;

Eighty-two Division commendations;

Sixty-five Distinguished Service Crosses;

Two hundred ninety Silver Stars; and

Seven hundred eight-two Bronze Stars.

All of this was not accomplished without suffering and sacrifice. So many of these men were casualties that throughout Europe the 100th Infantry was known as the "Purple Heart Battalion." Six hundred forty-eight of them made the supreme sacrifice. Thus did those splendid men demonstrate a fact some of us are, at times, prone to forget, namely that good Americanism is determined by what one has in his heart. If any further evidence of the quality of their citizenship is desired, it can be found in the records of the Hawaii Police Department, which show a lower rate of crime, per capita, among our Americans of Japanese ancestry than for any other racial group, including the Caucasian.

It may surprise you, as it did me, to learn that the educational system of Hawaii is such as to invite the envy of many of us on the mainland. The record discloses that compulsory education for all children six and older became mandatory in Hawaii as early as 1835. I need not tell you that this was many, many years before it became law in some States. The salary scale and other benefits for Hawaii's teachers are higher than prevail in any States except New York and Louisiana. The fact that all teachers, both rural and urban, are paid on the same wage scale makes it possible for rural children to be taught by teachers of identical qualifications to those who teach the children in Honolulu with its quarter of a million people. A congressional committee investigating Hawaii's qualifications for statehood reported that in 1945 rural teachers in the continental United States were paid an average annual salary of $1,018 as compared with $2,014 in Hawaii. Today's compensation, of course, is even higher. Their high schools, for example, require four full years of English—incidentally, only 15 States have such a requirement.

Contrary to the popular mainland conception, Hawaii's economy does not

rest upon her tourist trade. It is basically dependent upon her agriculture. Here is a good example of what Hawaii has accomplished in agriculture:

Because the land is mostly mountainous, only about 7 percent is in cultivation on all crops. This total acreage in cultivation is, roughly, 420 square miles. Hawaii produces annually:

First. Twice as much sugar as the total combined yields of Louisiana and Florida, with a value of $100,000,000;

Second. Ninety percent of the world's pack of pineapples, valued at more than $60,000,000;

Third. Six and one-half million pounds of coffee; and

Fourth. Diversified crops valued at about $12,000,000.

Hawaii has a very high annual income; yet the income is not confined to any one segment of her people. The record will disclose that even her field workers receive an hourly wage in excess of 75 cents. I am sure it would interest you to learn that in 1948 Hawaii paid into the Federal Treasury more tax money than did 12 of our States. By way of example, 2,000,000 people of Mississippi paid Uncle Sam $106,000,000, or $53 per capita—the half million people of Hawaii paid Uncle Sam $108,000,000, or $216 per capita.

It has been my privilege to visit Hawaii and I have profound respect for and confidence in the loyalty, devotion, and patriotism of this segment of Americans. I might say that I spent many hours checking into Hawaii's background and economy, and I have been unable to develop what, in my mind, is one sound reason why Hawaii should not be granted statehood.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair [Mr. HARDY], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. If the House meets tomorrow will the unfinished business be further consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill?

The SPEAKER. If the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House for that purpose, yes; whether or not it will, I do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I not state to the gentleman in all frankness so that the House will be advised, that if the House meets tomorrow it is my intention after unanimous-consent requests are made and 1-minute speeches are disposed of, to move that the House adjourn.

I am keeping my agreement. We have done everything we can. It is rather difficult for me to understand why the situation is not completely appreciated.

The first time the House could act would be Monday under suspension.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman intend to submit his request again?

Mr. McCORMACK. When a gentleman objects, unless he himself tells me he has withdrawn his objection, I will not renew a request. I simply wish to advise the membership what I intend to do so that they can govern themselves accordingly. We are doing everything we can.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The majority leader is always seductive when he starts out with such flattery, and it makes it very difficult to maintain a position in opposition to his views.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; it is the truth; it is not flattery.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Massachusetts states, if I understand him correctly, that he will move that the House adjourn tomorrow following consent requests and 1-minute speeches.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; because the earliest we can consider any coal legislation is Monday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman, then, is taking upon himself the responsibility of saying that the House would not consider this coal emergency tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is not taking that responsibility. The gentleman from South Dakota should not take that position, because it is not fair. The gentleman from Massachusetts takes the position that the earliest that the House can consider it is Monday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The House could consider it tomorrow by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Such action is an impossibility.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. It is my understanding that the only way in which the House could consider this legislation tomorrow would be by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is right.

Mr. TACKETT. That is the reason why we should adjourn over until Monday now. If consent is asked to consider such legislation tomorrow I will object to its consideration. I say this hoping it may help clarify the situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman from Arkansas wishes to take the responsibility of saying it is impossible to consider the legislation tomorrow because he will object——

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. TACKETT. I will take it.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; the gentleman stepped in. I think the fair position is that Monday is the earliest date on which it could possibly be expected to bring up the legislation.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I do this in my responsibility here today on the minority side. I feel constrained to say that I discussed this matter, or rather the Speaker and the majority leader discussed the matter with me as to the earliest date this coal legislation could be considered, and it was understood among us that it would very definitely appear that the earliest time would be on Monday. It was on that basis that I inquired of the majority leader earlier this evening in my over-all question as to the program, whether or not he expected to seek permission to adjourn the House over until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. I made no such observation, because it was the general opinion that Monday was the earliest that it could be considered. I stated I had received information, and it is purely information—I cannot say anything reliable—that the Senate committee might be called to consider it this afternoon and if reported out the Senate would pass it.

Monday is the earliest date that any responsible Member could expect the House to act. Fortunately it is Consent Calendar Day, otherwise we would have to get unanimous consent or a special rule out of the Rules Committee making it in order. It cannot be brought up except by those two methods.

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

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of revision of our tax laws.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TAURIELLO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter notwithstanding that it exceeded two pages of the RECORD and, according to the Public Printer, cost $191.34 to print.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of Louis Johnson.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an interesting article appearing in the Evening Tribune, of Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include newspaper articles.

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

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THIS IS AMERICA'S HOUR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to speak at this time in order to call the attention of the Members of the House to a very informative and impressive sermon delivered at the National Presbyterian Church in Washington on Sunday, February 19, by Rev. Louis H. Evans, D. D., LL. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Hollywood, Calif.

The sermon is a masterpiece. In my opinion, it should be made available insofar as possible to every thinking citizen in this country. I am submitting it for the RECORD in the hope that it may receive the wide recognition to which I feel it is entitled.

The sermon reads as follows:

"Blessed is that nation, whose God is the Lord and the people whom He hath chosen for his inheritance." (Psalms 33: 12.)

It is evident by this text that God has a philosophy of history—that He chooses what nations He will for His cosmic plan.

Deity has undoubtedly smiled at the many sacred anthropomorphisms, figures, similes, and pictures that we have put together in our endeavor to describe Him and His attributes. We have pictured God as a Ruler upon a throne; as a Father which art in the heavens providing for His little brood; as the Lord of Hosts leading His forces to battle; as the Judge upon the universal bench ever doing righteously; in Genesis He is pictured as the Holy Spirit, as a Mother bending over the cradle of the universe and crooning over the young child humanity. Yet the most touching picture I have seen of God was one in which He was sitting at the table of the universe playing chess, and the nations and the men were His pawns. He was playing a great game of strategy and His aim was to build a Kingdom of Righteousness. The free will of man, as He chose to give it, seemed at times to allow such moves on the part of evil men and nations as to retard His progress and thwart His victory. Yet one was conscious always that God would win in the end and that the last maps would always be made in heaven. In the moves on the chessboard of history "careless seemed the Great Avenger, yet behind the great unknown stood God keeping watch o'er His own."

As nations served His divine purpose, they remained on the chessboard of history but when they got in His way, or in the way of the good of mankind, He removed them from the board. Nineteen civilizations had already been moved from the chessboard of history, for this strategic game was played with many men. A study of history has shown that nations have been His pawns and His pieces and this has been His strategy with knights and castles and kings and queens and bishops and pawns.

Benjamin Franklin at the framing of the Constitution, when he was 81, spoke these words:

"I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And, if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this, and I also believe that, without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel."

Let us glance now hastily at the way in which God has moved and used various nations in the over-all strategy in this game of the spirit and the kingdom.

Israel was to be used as His chosen people to convey His truth and His oracles to the nations with whom this people should come in contact. But first of all Israel must be tutored—she must learn obedience to God, humility, and dependability upon Jehovah. This she must learn in the throes of captivity.

Thus Babylon is raised up and a part of these people is carried captive and under Babylonian yoke God's people learned obedience and a reaching out of hand and heart to Jehovah's guidance. The ministry of Babylon is done and she is soon to be removed from the chessboard of nations.

Persia now rises to power and by the prophets Cyrus is called the "tool of Jehovah" and God maneuvers this knight of history into such position as will enable him with his armies to knock with his mailed fists on the brass gates of Babylon and Babylon falls. God is done with Persia in its might.

Greece must now be born. A light of hope is soon to break. Immanuel, "God is with us," is soon to be born in Bethlehem and such speech will be His, such magnitude of thought and hope, that somewhere must be found a language that will rightly frame this message. It must contain fine shades of philology and meaning and be a fit vehicle for the expression of this new gospel. Thus Greece is born. God sets in the fanatical mind of young Alexander the determination that the whole world will think Greek, live Greek, and speak Greek. On the emory wheel of Greek education, Paul the Apostle will polish the facets of His mind and fill up the evangelist, will receive his forensic powers. Much of the world will speak Greek and this will give God speech. Greece with her naked intellect will lack certain spiritual qualities and Greece will succumb.

The Romans now will come to power and they will make two definite contributions in preparation for the Christian era. Rome will give to the world a sense of world empire and kingdom sweep until the expression, "Jesus Emperator" will seem reasonable and the world will be ready for a cosmic king. Rome will also furnish means of communication and the Roman roads will make way for the dispersal of this new message to the far corners of the earth. Paul desires to "preach the gospel to them that are at Rome also," knowing that a gospel heard at Rome would soon be heard around the world. Having made these two contributions to God's strategy, Rome dies, as Papini, noted Italian historian and scholar says, for three reasons: "Because the temple, the bank, and the academy were against Jesus of Nazareth." Such triple inadequacy would mean the ruin and death of any nation.

The Goths and Huns now come to power. Beneath the barbarian skins of these Germanic peoples lie the potentials of philosophy and spiritual insight. The German mind builds up the German university and the Christian clergy swarm to the German classroom to receive their higher degrees in Christian philosophy. Then came the decay of the German mind, in the psyche of materialism. A great German philosopher, when asked why Germany collapsed so suddenly, replied, "Germany did not collapse suddenly, they pushed God out of the universities in Germany 50 years ago and that was the beginning of the death sentence for the empire." That could happen here. The great Germany died.

Now came the Anglo-Saxons and how vital they became. The Druids put aside their human sacrifices and sang hymns and Gaelic peoples held high banners with crosses on them. Britain became the greatest colonizing empire in the world and with her often went the emissaries of the cross. Her most illustrious queen held in her hand a Bible and said, "England is the land of the Book." Now someone has said that approximately only fifteen out of every hundred Britons are active in any Christian church. We agree with Churchill that we would not wish to see the disintegration of the British Empire. Will England pass out of the picture in our day? May these warning words of Kipling, one of Britain's great sons never come to fruition within the pale of your memory and mine:

"Far flung our navies melt away,
On dune and headland sinks the fire;
All of our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet
Lest we forget, lest we forget!"

Now America is placed on the board of history—so definitely held in the hand of God. There was no question in the minds of our early fathers that the express purpose of America's history must be to play the game in furthering this kingdom of God's righteousness.

Our pilgrim fathers, by the light of the smoking lamp on the *Mayflower*, before landing at Plymouth, inserted these words into the Mayflower Compact.

"We whose names are underwritten have undertaken for the glory of God to establish in Virginia the first colony for the advancement of the Christian faith."

Ten years later, in 1630, other Pilgrims said in the New England Federation Compact agreement, "We all have come into these parts of America with one and the same end, namely to advance the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ." America was established as an experiment station to show what would happen to any people who cared and dared to follow Jesus Christ.

We received our Constitution from the church. John Witherspoon, a clergyman who signed the Declaration of Independence, was a Presbyterian elder and a professor in Princeton University. At his feet sat a young

man named James Madison with a mind keen as a rapier imbibing from his professor the principles of the church of the old country—the sovereignty of God, the freedom of the individual, and the form of representative government borrowed from the church of which he had been and was a part. Then, in the same era in which John Witherspoon drew up the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, James Madison, his pupil, was instrumental in drawing up the Constitution of the United States of America which was borrowed from the idealism and representative government propounded by his professor and the church. So definite and great was this source and this contribution that Green, famous historian of the English people, said that the Constitution of the United States was the gift of the Presbyterian Church. Our history has been inseparable from Christianity.

The Pilgrims landed in Plymouth in the name of Christ. The Huguenots took New England in the name of God. William Penn settled Pennsylvania in the name of the Nazarene, and the padres landed on the shores of California with a crucifix in their hand. The kiss of God has been upon our face as we have grown from national babyhood to what we trust is but our young manhood.

Scanning history we have never expected to do anything compelling without the leadership of God in Christ and without the kingly guidance of the Nazarene, we seem to do nothing well. Washington is on his knees at Valley Forge and so vital is the contribution of the church in revolutionary love for liberty that the Revolutionary War was called a church rebellion. Lincoln rises from his knees, his eyes bloodshot with praying, and exclaims "I know that liberty is right because Christ teaches it and Christ is God, and if there is a place for me to be offered I am ready now." How often did the pew of a certain church find Honest Abe sitting before the challenge of the Christian emancipation? Thus from the beginning of our free sovereignty we have had no human king. Ours has been a nation in which every man was royal but no man cared to wear a crown, yet conscious always that in the deeper chambers of our souls we had a king—

"Our fathers' God to Thee, author of liberty
To Thee we sing. Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light, protect us by Thy might
Great God, our King."

This is America's hour—an hour in which the world is watching her and demanding that she answer a question, the question is this, "Has your Hebraic Christian religion worked with you? Will your Christian ethics suffice? Is Christ sufficient? Or shall we look for another? A Swedish prince gripping me by the hand said some time ago, 'Dr. Evans, you Americans must not let God fail within your midst. He is the only One the world has left and the world is watching you. You must not fail us.' "

The world knows our background and our history has forced them to demand this. Contend as you and I will that America has never been thoroughly Christian and that there have never been 20 minutes when all Americans have followed Jesus Christ and yet they will say, "God has been there; we have seen his footprints on the pages of your history." They will not excuse our religious inadequacy; they will permit us no feeling of irresponsibility and will grant us no satisfaction or excuse for spiritual inferiority.

This question is hurled at us now, "What is the result of the cross in operation?" In this hour of fluid decision the world is getting ready to decide. This is a world of logic and the spirit of the times is pragmatic, experimental, practical, and utilitarian. Mankind will keep consistently asking, "Does it work for you?" This will be the genius of our world leadership—not what we say but what we are; it will not lie in our profession but in our performance. This is the logistics of the spirit—the foreign-missionary enterprise abroad will depend to a great degree upon the success of national missions at home. Our answer as to whether or not we will use God's program will have a great deal to do with whether or not America remains on the chessboard of His divine strategy.

America needs a rebirth of the spirit if she is to maintain her world leadership.

We could spend considerable time here reiterating the virtues and the greatness that have made us unwilling to trade her for any other land under the sun. God bless America, land that we love.

Yet our consciousness of her inadequacies is not an antonym of love. The doctor's alertness to his patient's disease is a token of his concern. The nurse's sensitivity is a sign of her usefulness. The church's honest appraisal of a nation's need is lovingly to the end of its cure. J. B. Priestly once said:

"We should behave toward our country as women behave toward the men they love. A loving wife will do anything for her husband except stop criticizing and trying to improve him.

"We should cast the same affectionate but sharp glance at our country. We should love it, but also insist on telling it all its faults. The noisy, empty patriot, not the critic, is the dangerous citizen."

No form of national betrayal might be worse than a blind, complete satisfaction with one's own land. Jesus loved Jerusalem, and wept over it.

In America we are facing a tragic malnutrition of the spirit. The head of one of our great national missions boards said that, "More people numerically (not precentagewise) are without God in America now than ever before in our history," and that "a greater number of Americans are out of touch with spirituality according to our standards than ever before in our national history." It is estimated that there are some 27,000,000 youths in America who have no definite religious instruction, and are as spiritually illiterate as though they had been born on the South Sea islands.

It has been estimated that 40 percent of our grammar school children have no connection with any religious organization; that 80 percent of our high school students have no definite affiliation with organized religion; that 90 percent of our university students "slept in" last Sunday morning.

What are the results of this spiritual malnutrition in our land? A crime problem, which is probably the worst in all our history, with a rape in America every 52 minutes, though we have applied to this problem our finest and our keenest brains. Insobriety and alcoholism strike at 3,500,000 persons annually, and 100,000 women and girls are in institutions for inebriates, 60 percent of them, the doctors say, as condemned to death as though they had cancer. Between one-third and one-fourth of our American homes are destroyed by divorce. And the newspapers reek with the records of our moral failures.

This is the hour for the church. From her hearthside have come the missionary statesmen of the world. From her cupboard comes the spiritual food by which multitudes are fed. Her tables yield the vitamins of the spirit. From her wardrobe men must be clothed with the "garments of righteousness." Minds must be lighted by the spiritual fuel within her lamps. And the milk of her human kindness must feed a slowly starving flock of worldlings.

America is in the grip of a gnawing sense of loneliness that has seized the American people. Seventy million Americans have moved their residences since the war. Stephen Laird has pictured for us these people torn from home, toil, kindred, community church and community responsibility and for the most part these ties have not been renewed. People are frustrated, not so much about taxes, the high cost of living, jobs, but about friendships. "Nobody seems to care." What has happened? America has become a nation of migrants. Going to camps, pouring in and out of war plants, fleeing from dust bowls, pouring into the city from the country and back into the country from the city. GI's are looking around trying to settle down, but the average veteran knows more about his bus ticket than he does about his Bible. Nobody seems to care what is happening to them. He goes on to relate that a certain writer in New York was asked the question, "Have you written anything since I last saw you?" "No, I just don't seem able to sit in an apartment and write. Almost every evening I find myself walking along the streets, dropping into bars, sitting opposite a man or girl my age in a restaurant, hoping to start a conversation, to make a friend or meet someone worth talking to." "Any luck?" "No," he said, "Everybody seems to be busy with himself. I get so lonesome I hate to go home any more."

Thus America, with plenty on her table, goes home hungry for companionship and God and for someone who cares. Along the crowded dogged streets, the lonely streets, men need that old hymn "What a fellowship, what a joy divine leaning on the everlasting arms."

The church must invite these lonely souls to the firesides of the spirit. We must pursue these migrants of body and soul into every hamlet, Middlesex village, farm, and metropolis, remembering that:

"Across the crowded ways of life,
Where sounds the cry of race and clan,
Above the noise of selfish strife
They need Thy voice, O Son of Man."

It is the spirit of God that we need in this hour—the upward pull of God.

Should you attempt on a pool table, with ball and cue, to herd together in close proximity the other balls on the table you would probably end up with a total result of the several balls being farther away from each other than they were when you began your attempt. This horizontal effort would prove somewhat fruitless. If, on the other hand, you would with scotch tape affix to each ball separately a strand of string, and taking these several strings in your hand exert an upward pull, you would find that automatically the balls would nestle together in a compact, orderly way.

Our efforts at brotherhood and world fraternity have for the most part been unsuccessful because the effort has been on the horizontal. We have tried with the cue and ball of laws, treaties, wars, leagues, regimentation, and other mechanistic means to drive or herd men together into a fraternity. Over-all the result has been rather to separate them. If, on the other hand, we could subject individuals and groups to the upward tug of the spirit and allow God to exert the uplifting tug on the hearts of men we should find them nestling together in the collective fraternity that we all so earnestly desire. But this deeper fraternity and sorority must be of the spirit.

It is quite evident that the horizontal force of war has failed to do this. A Boy Scout leader suggested that three members of his troop who had failed to do a good deed for

that day be dismissed from the Scout meeting for a half hour in order to go out and perform it. They came back shortly and stood before him in a state of very bad repair. One had his face scratched, another had a bloody nose and a torn neckerchief, and the third Scout had lost both his hat and his equilibrium. The Scoutmaster asked, "What in the world have you boys been doing?" "We were doing our good turn, sir, and helping an old lady across the street." "But why all the fuss and trouble?" asked the Scoutmaster. The spokesman said with due solemnity, "Well you see, sir, she didn't want to go." In the spirit of true Boy Scouts, you and I might wish to do our good turn by forcing humanity across the street from hatred to love and from war to brotherhood, but if humanity does not wish to go humanity will not go, and the sum total result will probably be bloody noses, torn neckerchiefs, lost hats and equilibrium, chaos and war.

In the realm of business, America needs the baptism of the spirit. A financial expert, this one not defined as "a man who has a Tau Kappa Alpha key at one end of his chain and no watch at the other," was asked to examine both personnel and program of a large factory to ascertain why it was going to pieces. After thorough investigation he called them together from the president to the board of directors to managers of personnel and labor on to the last man who worked at the lathe. Calmly and decisively he said, "This factory needs conversion immediately." The president remonstrated, "But we are in the process of converting our machinery." The expert replied, "I am not talking about the conversion of machines. I am talking about the conversion of men. From the chairman of the board of directors to the last man who works at the lathe, you are all rotten with selfishness. Unless you convert the hearts of this firm from selfishness to unselfishness you will suffer nothing but disaster." Why not get at the root of the matter—self? You and I know, in our best moments, that the passing of the Taft-Hartley bill or the repealing of it will be little more than treating the pimples on the skin, when deeper down the blood stream is bad.

Sociologically America needs a new birth. It is one thing to have good building plans as the sociologists do for a new society, but where will they find the new materials? One clergyman has stated, "No clever arrangement of bad eggs will ever give you a good omelet." No clever sociological collective arrangement of bad persons is going to give you a good society, as much as we believe in organization. The soul of improvement will always be in the improvement of the soul. You cannot have a new deal with the same old people nor a fair deal with unfair individuals. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," then come these words, "Behold all things are becoming new." It is difficult to change things externally without changing people internally. Social reconstruction will rest upon individual regeneration.

So far as our racial differences and prejudices are concerned, we deal here with an equilateral triangle. Our God-man relationship is the altitude which determines our man-to-man relationship which is the base. It is an adequate sense of the fatherhood of God on the perpendicular that will force us to an adequate brotherhood of man on the horizontal and it has been proven that it is difficult to have an adequate sociology and love for man unless you have an adequate theology and love for God. Until then, our Nation will be broken up into brittle little bits on the basis of blood and ethnological conceits.

American education needs a baptism of the spirit. When Horace Mann claimed that if we would send people to school, we would cut down crime nine-tenths, it was a hundred years ago in the State of Massachusetts. We have tried to experiment and greatly increased our educational facilities but in that time crime has increased 800 percent. It is quite evident that all our problems do not revolve around a cranium and naked intellect alone is not enough to see us through. Educators are not so much interested now in the size as in the sort of our pupils. Education is no longer merely about information but about formation of character. It is no longer merely a matter of what our young people know but, more important still, of how they feel.

Speaking to one of our great American writers an alumnus of Yale said, "You know, sir, Yale has added another branch of research to its curriculum. Yale now has all the branches." The great scholar and writer wistfully replied, "Yes, Yale has all the branches, but Yale has none of the roots." That is an unfair thing to say about Yale. I lunched with its great professor, William Lyon Phelps, shortly before his death and that conversation was along the line of a previous statement of his: "Jesus knew more about political economy than all the professors in all of the colleges of the world. He knew more about the human heart than Shakespeare. While I am not sure of many things, I am as sure as I stand here that Jesus is the greatest leader, the most absolutely right person the world has ever known. The leadership of Jesus Christ in our lives ought to be made constant in everything. * * * But I am not out of my mind when I say that the only way the world can be saved today is by following Jesus Christ." What the commentator on that university wished to portend and to say was probably this—that if we build up a colossal system of secular education as a gigantic tree with all the branches of research, the twigs of knowledge and a massive trunk of secular content, and fail to ground education in the roots of spiritual purpose, merciful motivation, and religious aim, we shall see this thing topple over on us and crush us in a scientific age.

A great nostalgia for God is sweeping the universities of America along with the realization of the insufficiency of humanism and the mere factual. Both faculty and students are begining to realize that unless the "soul catches up with the brain" the degree B. A. will again, in the next era of chaos, stand for "Builder of Alibis."

Our homes need saving and the sides of the triangle—husband and wife—will be best held together by the extrovert base, God and His Kingdom and their unselfish purposes. While one out of every three or four homes are broken by divorce in America, someone has stated that only one out of every 57 church homes suffer this decay. There is evidently something then in Christianity and the presence of God at the hearthside which gives the home 15 times the chance of standing and surviving with religion than it would have without its benefits.

America is not leading the nations in law abidingness. We shall never attain that leadership until in the realm of law men feel the guilt more than the punishment. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, has reminded us of how difficult it is to reform the adult criminal and how vital it is that youth receive the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount and the Ten Commandments. He reminded us not to forget that the Sunday school and the church were the greatest moral forces in our Nation. Until we set up in the tribunal of the human heart a love for the laws of God and society we shall go on for another generation "making new laws for old sinners to cheat by."

America has won the war—but only on paper. We do not conquer the Japanese when we merely take the guns out of their hands. Not until we have taken wrong goals out of their hearts have we won a lasting victory. A personal friend of mine reported that MacArthur had made a request for 18,000,000 bibles for Japan and wanted 3,000 missionaries in order that Japan might be properly exposed to Christian teachings. He felt that this war was "a theological war" and that unless the bad theology of Amatarasu, the Sun goddess, loving only the slant-eyed people, could be changed to the universal fatherhood of God through Jesus Christ and that high concept, Japan would never have a sociology and a brotherhood that would enable her to make her contribution to a lasting peace. As one GI said, "America with her rich spiritual heritage should remember that it will never do for her merely to give her enemies 'a licking,' she must also give her enemies 'a light'."

Communism is challenging us to outlive it with Christianity.

John Foster Dulles claims that communism enters a nation as a Trojan horse. In clever disguise it enters the gates of a city or a nation and only after its entrance do people realize what lurks inside. Communism thrives on the failures of others. It makes its garments out of the holes and frets in others. Communism builds its ship of state out of the driftwood of the wreckage of other systems that lies along the shores of contemporary failures. Communism does not work. It only thrives on the supposition that other ideologies have not worked. It is the question of the cross as over against the sickle. They will whisper to the African in Africa, "How do you like the way black men are treated by Christians in America?" They will say to those in Mexico, "Are you pleased with the treatment received by Mexicans in the American Southwest?" To those of China they may make the query, "Are the 28,000 Chinese of the San Francisco area impressed by the Americans who live under the sign of the cross?" Of labor they inquire, "Has Christianity taken the crown of thorns from your brow?" Of those of great possessions, they do ask, "Along with your property do you possess peace?" The line is down now and the question is inescapable. Will the cross out-demonstrate the sickle? Our own type of democracy at its best was born in the Christian concept and democracy will not "democ" without Christ, as someone contended. America will not be able to stand, any more than Rome was able to stand, if her banks—her economic system; her academy—her educational system; and her temple—her religious system are against Jesus of Nazareth.

It will be difficult to match the propaganda of communism but we must outmatch her performance. We must not only "out-promise" them, we must also "outpassion" them. We must teach our youth the concepts of the Kingdom of God with greater earnestness and thoroughness than they teach their youth of the Kremlin. The open hand of democracy must prove itself more potent than the clenched fist of communism. We will find it difficult to outlaw communism; we must outlive communism. And this is the hour of dynamic demonstration.

I am not advocating a narrow nationalism when I say, "God bless America and give us success." In this I am pleading for a supranationalism. I want to see her continued on the chessboard of history because she makes her contribution to this strategic game of righteousness among the nations that God

is playing. I want to see her continue to be a tool in the hand of Jehovah.

This is a personal equation. U. S. spells "us." America fulfills her spiritual Christian destiny only as God possesses our individual purses, powers, and persons. Each must do his and her part for the collective righteousness.

A student at Penn State College said to me sometime ago, "Dr. Evans, I prayed a great prayer last night—the bravest I have prayed." "What was it?" I said. He replied, "I prayed, 'O God, may I always be honest enough never to ask Thee to do for the world collectively what I have not first allowed Thee to do for me personally'."

Let us not expect of the nations any more ready forgiveness of their enemies collectively than our forgiveness of our enemies personally. Let us never expect the nations of the UNO to be any less selfish than we are in our personal relationships.

"We who are Americans must be too big for shame.
We are the guardians of a faith from which our glory came.
Ours is a splendor truly won, in us all people trust.
We face this world as men who are great hearted, kind, and just.
And he who fails to play his part in high or little place
Shames not alone himself but brings disgrace upon his race."

The light that shines brightest at home shines farthest abroad. The light will shine farthest when we wash the lamp chimney or cleanse the lens through which it shines.

We do pray "America first"—first in usefulness to God. First in her availability to the spiritual kingdom enterprise. First in power that she may bend over the weak and suffering. First in wealth that she may share it with others in mercy. First in light if she be a lamp in the darkness. First in strength that she may bear the infirmities of the weak. First in purity that others may sup from our cleansed wells. Let us couch our national concern for our Nation and our flag, in this strategic hour, in the words of G. Ashton Oldham:

"America first, not only in things material,
But in things of the spirit.
Not merely in science, invention, motors, skyscrapers,
But also in ideals, principles, character.
Not merely in the calm assertion of rights,
But in the glad assumption of duties.
Not flouting your strength as a giant,
But bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a good Samaritan.
Not in splendid isolation,
But in courageous cooperation.
Not in pride-arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples,
But in sympathy, love and understanding.
Not in treading again the old, worn bloody pathway
Which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster,
But blazing a new trail, along which, please God,
Other nations will follow into the new Jerusalem
Where war shall be no more.
Someday, some nation must take that path—
Unless we are to lapse into utter barbarism—
And that honor I cover for my beloved America.
And so in that spirit, and with these hopes,
I say with all my heart and soul, 'America first.'"

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a sermon by Rev. Louis H. Evans.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DEANE, for March 3 at 1 p. m., through Wednesday, March 8, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, March 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1281. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation, involving an increase of $60,600, for the fiscal year 1951 for the legislative branch, Library of Congress, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 493); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1282. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Gorgas Memorial Laboratory and Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 494); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1283. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting final financial statement of the American Legion up to and including December 31, 1949, pursuant to the Act of Incorporation of the American Legion, Public Law 47, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1284. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of the Interior"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1285. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Johannes Akk or John Ackly, file No. A-1374775 CR 26427, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1286. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $10,748,500 for the Department of Agriculture, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 1746. An act to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of the United States of a portion of the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., for use in connection with the United States Penitentiary at Terre Haute; without amendment (Rept. No. 1729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. S. 1008. An act to define the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (Rept. No. 1730). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 7544. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Wyoming over offenses committed on that portion of United States Highway No. 30 lying within the Francis E. Warren Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7545. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, approved June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 7546. A bill to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7547. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to motor carriers excepted from certain provisions of part II of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7548. A bill to exempt from tax admissions to moving-picture theaters, and to restore the prewar exemptions from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7549. A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7550. A bill to amend section 1404 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the transfer of certain civil actions from one district to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 7551. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7552. A bill to restore national coal production; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 7553. A bill to stabilize income of herring fishermen in Alaska and prices of products of the Alaska herring industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 7554. A bill to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Expenditures of the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7555. A bill to provide for the allotment of certain lands to Indian veterans of World War II who are members of tribes located on Indian reservations in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7556. A bill to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 7557. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 500. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 7402, a bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families; to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. H. 7558. A bill for the relief of William W. Tant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Honora Redman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7560. A bill for the relief of Mary Frances Yoshinaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 7561. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Peter Petropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7562. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Southern States Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 7563. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nicola Di Palma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1950. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Homer L. Clough and other citizens of Halltown, Mo., urging the passage of H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1951. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. L. G. Patrick and many other citizens of Howell County, Mo., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1952. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. B. R. Tatom and many other citizens of Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1953. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Horace W. Cope and other citizens of Noel, Mo., urging the passage of the Townsend bills, H. R. 2135 and 2136; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1954. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Peter Frost Muller and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1955. Also, petition of J. F. Anstett and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1956. Also, petition of B. W. Kellogg and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1957. Also, petition of W. F. Lewis and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1958. Also, petition of J. H. Richmond and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 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:

Eternal God, who puttest down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek, look with compassion upon our Nation as we strive to mend its flaws and make it the fit instrument of Thy will in these troubled days. History's tragic pages but remind us that Thy providence knows no favorites, that none can bend Thy justice and none can break Thy laws that shall not themselves be broken. Facing duties and decisions that far outweigh our own strength and our own wisdom, we ask for the guidance of the Kindly Light to lead us on o'er crag and torrent till the night be passed. Help us this and every day to live more nearly as we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 3, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is entitled to the floor.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, several weeks ago the Secretary of Defense urged all members of the Subcommittee on Armed Forces of the Committee on Appropriations to accompany him to the Caribbean area to observe naval maneuvers which, he said, would be the largest peacetime maneuvers in which the Navy had engaged. Feeling that I should acquire all the information I could concerning our defense equipment and the skill with which it can be used, I desire to accompany the Secretary of Defense on the trip next week. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from March 6 to March 9, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MUNDT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

EUGENIO MAISTERRENA BARRENECHE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), I return herewith Senate bill 204, entitled "An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 1950.*

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches, and without taking the Senator from Mississippi from the floor.

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

DREDGING OF CHANNEL AND MOORING BASIN IN WELLFLEET HARBOR, MASS.—PETITION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition embodying a resolution adopted by the citizens of Wellfleet Harbor, Mass., and signed by Beatrix Faust, Martha C. Porch, and Lynne P. Townsend, favoring the enactment of legislation providing funds necessary for the dredging of a channel and mooring basin in the harbor of Wellfleet.

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

To the Congress of the United States:

By unanimous vote of the town of Wellfleet at the regular town meeting February 13, 1950, the committee whose signatures are attached to this petition were instructed to address the following memorial to the Congress of the United States relative to an approved project for dredging a channel and mooring basin in Wellfleet Harbor. The