

William L. Bryson
Stanley A. Buzzelle
John J. Casey
Thomas A. Cassin
Franklyn L. Clark
Eldon O. Coffey
Murry Cohn
William W. Collier
Foster F. Comstock
James J. Conlin, Jr.
Raymond K. Connell
Francis S. Cooksey
Hugh L. Culbreath, Jr.
Clarence A. Creel
Philip Crosby
Oscar M. Dale
Charles Daniel, Jr.
Clemens J. Denne
Julius C. Dinkel
Lewis Dobbs
Glen L. Dunlap
Paul Elam
William W. Fink, Jr.
George L. Fitchett
William O. Foulkes
Roy W. Fox
Charles A. Gardner, Jr.
Elmon A. Geneste, Jr.
Leo P. Girard
Lloyd Goolsby
Charles F. Grad
Anthony Grego
William N. Haddock
Harry J. Halley
Robert W. Hanwell
John G. Harper
Milton W. Harvey
Noble T. Hawkins
Paul W. Hebert
Carl L. Henn, Jr.
James W. Herb
James I. Hightower, Jr.
Jack W. Hillman
Robert C. Hobbs
George P. Hoffman
John W. Holmes
Carl M. Johnson
Kimey Johnson
William H. Johnson
Russell A. Jones
John E. Juracka
John C. Kelleher
Richard J. Kessler
Clyde D. Killion
Don H. Kleinhammer
Louie B. Knudsen, Jr.
Charles E. Kridle
Edward L. Kurek
David G. Lamborne
Carl E. Lamzik
James E. Laney
John W. Lipscomb, Jr.
Kenneth W. Longnecker
Mathew Mackey, Jr.
Howard L. Madden
Charles M. Mason
Laurens B. Mathews
Lester G. Maxwell
Archie B. Meihis, Jr.
Herbert F. Mills, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Peter H. Brewerton
Harold H. Cummings
John M. Danielsen
Andrew J. Grygiel
Robert M. Harrison
Deane W. Kennedy

LIEUTENANT, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Henry C. Besmen
Benjamin T. Dibble
Edward T. Diberto
Charles W. Graff
Ralph B. Grah, Jr.
Robert B. Jarvis
Howard T. Johnson
Custer F. Krickenberg, Jr.

Albert W. Moloney
Jack J. Moore
Francis W. Moseley
Wesley J. McClaren
Eyrle L. McCord
Robert J. McCormick
Edward M. McDonough
John E. McGraw
Gerry N. McLeod
Hugh A. McManus
Richard L. McNutt
Howard D. McPike
Richard E. Newton, Jr.
William A. Novak
Raymond S. O'Connell
James V. O'Connor
Paul D. O'Keefe
John J. O'Malley
John F. Paolantonio
Gerald J. Patton
Herman L. Philbrick
Robert K. Ponder
Robert C. Porter
William M. Poulson
Edmund J. Prosch
Lawrence O. Purkaple
Alvin H. Rampey
Elbert S. Rawls, Jr.
Frank R. Rephlo
Howard L. Rezner
Vernon G. Rivers
William J. Robinson
Edward S. Ruete
James M. Sappenfield
Robert A. Schaufler
Willard N. Schneider
Robert J. Schwarz
Clinton Searles
Paul C. Shumaker
William E. Sigman
Samuel R. Simpson, Jr.

Jack J. Skapin
Bert E. Smith
James A. Smith
Frank L. Spillman, Jr.
William W. Statia
William E. Stephens
Joseph H. Stevely
Hubert W. Stevens
Thomas E. Stevenson
Carl J. Stringer, Jr.
Donald D. Stumm
Toxie A. Thomas
Monte F. Tidmore
George H. Trece, Jr.
Earl A. Unger
Carl W. Utterback
Harris L. Vowels
David E. Ward
William A. Wheless
Charles E. Whiteside
William R. Whitney
Joe J. Wilcox
Wilbur A. G. Wilson
John J. Wohlschlaeger
Clarence S. Wood
Kenneth L. Woodfin
Paul W. Woodhead
James M. Wright
William D. Wright
Armand E. Wulffaert
William H. Yarborough

Allen S. Waters
Ervin E. White
John P. Williams

LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS

Luke J. Braxmeier
Warren C. Caldwell, Jr.
Stewart T. Elder
Bert E. Eldred
Loren F. Enke
William N. Grammer
Lewis L. Gunther
Theodore R. Hunley
Charles E. Kailer
Harvey W. Lyon
James A. Mitchell
Neale H. Morrow

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Hugo B. Bergstrom
Booth Chilcote
Neb B. Curtis
John W. Fechter
Francis H. Flynn
Thomas G. Fowler
Matthew F. Gallagher
Donald R. Gooden
Philip M. Griffith
Ernest N. Grover
Elie A. Gullbault
Richard W. Jenkins
Arthur E. Johnson
William E. Kelly

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Evelyn L. Aaberg
Sarah E. Adams
Barbara K. Allen
Grace L. Barrett
Elizabeth H. Barrington
Rita E. Belanger
Wilma R. Berg
Barbara E. Bernstein
Bertha Bernstein
Margaret B. Binkley
Julla M. Blair
Gaetana Blandino
Alice M. Bonora
Mary C. Burda
Clella P. Cain
Helen E. Casby
Ninetta M. Chapman
Mary G. Chisler
Jeanette F. Clabough
Ruth M. Crofton
Dorothy A. Dalesio
Marion M. Dooley
Anne Dubik
Virginia C. Duerr
Kathryn C. Duprea
Dorothy M. Edwards
Ruth S. Edmunds
Ruth E. Fabian
Elizabeth Feeney
Agnes Findlay
Cecilia C. Flannery
Frances J. Floriano
Hilda L. Freseman

For temporary appointment in the Naval Reserve:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Boyd Nethercott

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS

Benjamin J. Galeski
Walter W. Ledyard
William S. Markham

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Charles C. McCall
Richard A. Wier
Wesley J. Wiggin

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Newell V. Brink
Thomas V. Edwards

LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS

William N. Grammer
Ray B. Mueller

Joe R. Wilson
Sidney J. Wynne, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Jean E. Ackerman
Eleanor M. Antoine
Nancy M. Black
Louise Budrey
Jeanne E. Clarke
Alice J. Cochran
Calla V. Goodwin
Frances L. Harris

Bette L. Klinger
Catherine M. McCleary
Eleanor R. O'Donnell
Lorene J. Peake
Irene V. Prue
Helen F. Rickard
Besse R. Rummel
Myrtle L. Woodall

For permanent appointment in the Naval Reserve:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), LINE

Penrose L. Albright
Edward H. Barnes
Stig G. Gavelin
John A. Hucksteadt
Elmer G. Hultquist
Daniel R. Kinnaly
Alvin Masterson, Jr.

Edward J. Motzenbecker
Francis X. Sheehan
Alfred Stanford
Carl H. Swadell
Ronald A. Wallace
Gerald L. Wilda
Steve Zelisko

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), NURSE CORPS

Edith M. Goodell
Gladys I. Marsden
Julia M. Miller

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent or temporary appointment to the grades and corps indicated, and to correct typographical errors as previously nominated and confirmed.

For temporary appointment in the Navy:

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Henry S. Colony
Elmer R. King
Wilbur S. Lummler, Jr.
Arthur V. Miller, Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Richard A. Markham

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Chester M. Lessenden
Romulus L. May

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Ellsworth E. Richards

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Leif R. Larson

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Theron K. Eaton

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Cameron N. Stephenson

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Karl N. Keever

For permanent appointment in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Fonville Kelley

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Houston W. McGlothlin

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), LINE

William A. Buttler
Robert F. Schnledwind

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Joseph H. Benton

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

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

The Chaplain, Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, Thou dost gladden our eyes and thrill our beings with the glory

of Thy handiwork. Thou hast written Thy law in our hearts. In Thy fellowship alone we find peace for our spirits and power for our tasks. On every side Thou hast multiplied Thy benedictions. For the beauty of nature, in which Thou hast housed us like royal children in a palace, we thank Thee.

Save us from walking in a rich world yet being poor because our eyes are holden and our hearts calloused and insensitive.

In days of crisis and alarm, which are also days of opportunity and privilege, raise up the spirit of this people into unselfish citizenship. Make us hate with a deep and persistent hatred the things that should be hated and regard with holy indignation any act or attitude that betrays the public trust. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 12, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

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

On May 11, 1950:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

On May 13, 1950:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLIKIN were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 1 week beginning today.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAMS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FREAR was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the next 10 days, because of official business for the Subcommittee on Reconstruction Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet this

afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

Aiken	Hoey	Mundt
Benton	Holland	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Connor
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Darby	Kilgore	Stennis
Donnell	Knowland	Taft
Dworthak	Langer	Taylor
Eastland	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Lodge	Thye
Ferguson	Long	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young
Hill	Maybank	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WUMPHREY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matter for the RECORD, without debate, and without speeches.

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

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATING TO NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 176, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee during the Eighty-first Congress, first session, relative to the national health plan

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution. The motion was agreed to.

PETITION

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

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO WORK FOR THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Whereas the people of Ireland after long years of trial and tribulation have finally established their own free Government, and Ireland is now a sovereign, independent democratic state; and

Whereas the dream and the goal of all Irishmen has ever been a free and united Ireland; and

Whereas at the present time but six counties, politically a part of the United Kingdom, are set off from the rest of Ireland, and through political machinations and propaganda are denied the opportunity of uniting with their fellow countrymen: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to reaffirm its tenets of the democratic principle of the rights of any people to determine its own form of government, to work for the abolition of the present partition of Ireland, and to promote the establishment of a united Ireland with all Irishmen under one government and one flag; and be it further

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

In house of representatives, adopted May 3, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

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

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

IMPORTATION OF RUBBER AND OTHER PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Connecticut, relating to the importation of rubber and other products.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See text of resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice

President on May 11, 1950, p. 6889, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

**DISPOSITION OF LABOR DISPUTES—
RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE**

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at a meeting held April 14-16, 1950, by the board of directors of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, at French Lick, Ind., relating to the disposition of transportation labor questions.

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

**RESOLUTION ON AMENDMENT OF RAILWAY
LABOR ACT**

Labor legislation in the field of transportation should be developed and strengthened so that it can fairly and consistently dispose of labor-management problems without resort to strikes. Certain States have already pioneered in this field to the point of outlawing strikes with respect to all public utilities including transportation. It would seem not only consistent but highly essential that Federal legislation be developed to adequately protect both labor and management as well as the public interest in the disposition of transportation labor questions. The Railway Labor Act could be amended to form the basis for this kind of legislation and the decisions or proper boards of labor adjustment could be appealable to, and made enforceable in, the regular courts.

The board of directors of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce recommends that the Railway Labor Act be amended and strengthened to provide legal methods of fully disposing of labor controversies that will be fair and equitable to labor, management, investors, and to the general public and without interference with transportation service.

**FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS—RESOLUTION
OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE,
WIS.**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received this morning a letter from V. H. Hurlless, comptroller of the city of Milwaukee, enclosing a copy of an important resolution adopted by the common council of that great metropolis on May 8, 1950.

The resolution presented five recommendations for incorporation in the new Federal-aid highway legislation now pending before the House of Representatives.

We of Wisconsin are very proud of our road system but we are aware of the fact that there is still tremendous room for highway improvement and that such improvement involves traffic expenses.

I believe that the resolution will be of interest to my colleagues and so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas Federal motor vehicle taxes paid by highway users exceed \$1,000,000,000 annually; and

Whereas more than 50 percent of all vehicle-miles are traveled on urban streets; and

Whereas the average city main street carries six times as much traffic as the average main rural road; and

Whereas cities' street systems must be adequate to handle heavy traffic flows if the total United States highway system is to function properly; and

Whereas the average per mile cost of urban road construction is more than eight times that of the average rural road; and

Whereas Milwaukee and many other cities are finding that there is no substitute for express highways but that such highways are expensive to build and to maintain; and

Whereas cities are unable to build and to maintain sorely needed highway improvements without substantial contributions from the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is requested to incorporate the following five recommendations in their Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950:

1. At least \$125,000,000 should be annually made available for projects in urban areas.

2. Urban area funds which are not used by certain States because those States are unable to provide the required matching money should be annually redistributed to those States which can match it.

3. A discretionary fund of not less than \$25,000,000 should be provided annually for distribution to the States on the basis of critical needs.

4. Fifty percent of costs of acquiring rights-of-way should be payable from Federal-aid highway funds.

5. Urban areas which incur debt to expedite the federally aided highway system within their cities should be able to use Federal-aid funds for the repayment of such indebtedness; and be it further

Resolved, That the Comptroller be and hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to those Senators and Representatives who represent the city of Milwaukee and to the members of the Senate Committee on Public Works.

**THE 12½-PERCENT MILLING PROVISION—
TELEGRAM FROM R. H. MCCLAIN**

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from R. H. McClain, district vice president of the American Federation of Grain Millers International Union of Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. McClain points out in his telegram to me the disastrous effect that will follow the deletion of the 12½-percent milling provision in H. R. 7797.

Only last year by reason of a compromise there was retained the 12½-percent milling provision. In my opinion, no one can contend that the retention of this percentage, which is relatively low, could or would work a hardship in any manner whatever. The American taxpayers have furnished the funds most generously for the rehabilitation and for aid and assistance of needy European countries in the European recovery program. The products of our milling industry certainly are needed in the ECA program, and I am sure that the producers as well as the processors of wheat throughout the United States will consider the deletion of this 12½ percent

as a direct blow aimed at the sections of this country which are vitally interested in the production and the processing of wheat of all kinds.

As a Senator from one of the great wheat-producing sections, in conjunction with others who feel as I do, I protest this proposed deletion. It is of such vital importance that I think it should be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress, the industry, and the people at large.

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

KANSAS CITY, Mo., May 15, 1950.

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appeal to you to contact meeting on Joint House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committee and request that you retain the 12½-percent milling provision in H. R. 7797. We received word this morning that joint committee had decided to delete this provision but as yet their action has not been reported out of committee and there is a possibility that they would change their present position. If this provision is deleted, it means that several thousand people in flour milling industry will be thrown out of work and put on relief rolls. Also, many mills will be forced to shut down. Last year, foreign export of flour decreased 69 percent. We need the by products to be used for commercial feed purposes in this country. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

R. H. MCCLAIN,
District Vice President, American
Federation of Grain Millers International Union.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2386. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals, experiment station at Reno, Nev.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1558).

H. R. 7984. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557).

**ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY PERSONNEL
AND INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES
BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE**

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 275), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Eighty-first Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$3,000 (in addition to amounts heretofore made available for such purposes), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3587. A bill to provide for certain per capita payments to members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3588. A bill for the relief of Luigi Dini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3589. A bill to waive in certain cases the priority of payment of debts owing to the United States in the administration of a deceased debtor's estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3590. A bill for the relief of Toshiaki Ishigo and his children, Kiyoko and Chi-yiko Ishigo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3591. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Rebekah Degree, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IVES (by request):

S. 3592. A bill to increase the opportunities of blind persons for employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 3593. A bill for the relief of Nicolas de Rochefort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE PATH TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DWORSHAK

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the Mother's Day ceremonies sponsored by the American War Mothers, at Arlington National Cemetery, on May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT WE MUST DO TO STAY FREE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUNDT

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, What We Must Do To Stay Free, delivered by him at the annual membership meeting of the Executive-Foreman's Club of Elizabeth, N. J., with the questions and answers which ensued, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON FIRST FLIGHT'S DAY OF ROCK COUNTY AIRPORT

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the dedication ceremony of the Rock County Airport at Beloit, Wis., on May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a meeting of the Greater New York Hospital Association, in New York City, on May 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BERNARD M. BARUCH AT THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND CIVIC ADMINISTRATION, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Bernard

M. Baruch at the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the School of Business and Civic Administration, College of the City of New York, on May 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SYMINGTON ENERGIZES RESOURCES BOARD—ARTICLE FROM THE SUNDAY STAR

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Symington Energizes Resources Board," published in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDIAN BUREAU BUDGET PROPOSALS—LETTER FROM PURL WILLIS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated May 8, 1950, addressed to him by Purl Willis, counselor, Mission Indian Federation, San Diego, Calif., dealing with the budget proposals of the Indian Bureau for the Indians of California, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. TRUMAN BUILDS A (FIGURATIVE) DAM—ARTICLE BY EDWARD H. COLLINS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Truman Builds a (Figurative) Dam," written by Edward H. Collins, and published in the New York Times of May 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMPLOYMENT OF NEGROES IN BOSTON STORES—ARTICLE BY LAURA HADDOCK

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Better Jobs for Negroes Widening in Boston Stores," written by Laura Haddock, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GLORY OF AMERICAN HISTORY—EDITORIAL BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Glory of American History," written by Harry H. Schlacht, and published in the New York Journal-American of May 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ARTICLE BY W. H. LAWRENCE

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the railroad strike, by W. H. Lawrence, from the New York Times of May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILWAY STRIKE—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. DONNELL, by separate requests, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD 16 newspaper editorials, articles, and letters regarding the current railway strike, which appear in the Appendix.]

INDEPENDENCE OF FARMERS—ARTICLE BY PAUL C. JOHNSON

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "It's High Time the Farmer Threw Away Crutches," written by Paul C. Johnson and published in the Washington Post of May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAMPAIGN OF TRUTH—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Campaign of Truth," published in the Washington Post of May 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL—NEWS-PAPER AND CONGRESSIONAL COMMENTS

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from newspaper reports and comments and quotations from Members of Congress concerning the Kerr natural-gas bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON IN 1800—ARTICLE BY ALEXANDER R. GEORGE

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning Washington in 1800, written by Alexander R. George and published in the Washington Post of May 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROBLEM OF OLD-AGE SECURITY

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD some excerpts from the testimony of Prof. Sumner H. Slichter before the Senate Finance Committee in support of an expanded old-age insurance program, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNDER-COVER DEMOCRACY—EDITORIAL FROM THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser of Friday, May 12, entitled "Under-Cover Democracy," which points out clearly how completely the Democratic Party in Hawaii is controlled by the ILWU group, an organization that is generally considered as Communist controlled.

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

UNDER-COVER DEMOCRACY

Stripped of camouflage and false fronts, the question that Hawaii's Democrats are faced with today is whether their party shall be the personal possession of an undercover group, meeting secretly at a private home in the dead of night, or a public political organization subject to the will of its members.

The issue was raised in 1946 when Harry Bridges' agents packed the Democratic precinct clubs and took over the party machinery.

It was brought into focus when these leaders, who gained power through a coup, refused to aid in an investigation of communism conducted here by a Democrat-majority committee of Congress.

It came to a crisis when straight-line Democrats refused to sit in convention with these recalcitrant witnesses and set up a separate organization which recognized the authority of National Committeeman Charles E. Kauhane and National Committeewoman Victoria K. Holt, whom the left-wingers attempted to "fire" although they had no authority to do so.

It reached a climax when the left-wingers met secretly at night to set up a front organization listing new names but behind which remained the same old influences that have led Hawaii's Democrats into strange paths during the past 4 years.

The attempt to unseat Hawaii's members of the Democratic National Committee is not the gravest aspect of the situation the left-wingers have created but it presents probably the most graphic illustration of the arrogance of the captors who have seized the party machinery. Mr. Kauhane and Mrs. Holt already are members of the national committee for terms that have not expired. That committee is the judge of its own membership. No cliques outside the committee can remove its members. That is an

authority which the committee alone possesses.

To attempt to usurp this authority was a disservice to democracy in Hawaii that puts the Territory and its statehood aspirations in a bad light before a Democratic national administration. To follow it with an underground operation to dominate Hawaii's Democrats was an affront to the party's rank and file that is certain to be a source of deep resentment which is particularly harmful in an election year.

The Democratic Party in Hawaii is suffering bitterly from self-inflicted wounds. Still these need not be fatal if the rank and file Democrats throughout the Territory take their party's affairs into their own hands, remold them into the time-honored form that has earned the public's respect and demand unity of purpose among their leaders.

Hawaii's Democrats, leaders and followers, would do well to sit humbly at the foot of veteran Manuel Pacheco's hospital bed and listen to his wise counsel. "Politics, like everything else, needs sensible leadership, not selfish leadership," Sage Pacheco advises.

EFFECTS OF THE RAILROAD STRIKE—NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of many telegrams I have been receiving in connection with the strike of locomotive firemen. This telegram from E. C. Moriarty points out the present existing conditions as the strike affects the Santa Fe Railroad system from Los Angeles, Calif., to the city of Wichita, Kans. It is of such importance that I think it should be brought to the attention of the Senate of the United States and the country at large.

It shows the necessity of some practical type of legislation to protect the public interest and the thousands of communities of our country, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of people who are presently affected, and the millions who will be affected in the future if this strike continues.

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

WICHITA, KANS., May 14, 1950.

HON. ANDREW SCHOEPPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I just arrived from California on the Santa Fe Chief, one of the two trains running out of the seven California trains they regularly operate. The trip gave me a close-up view of the creeping paralysis being imposed on the country by a handful of railroad employees. At Los Angeles the effect was not so noticeable on account of the size of the city, but at the busy division point of Barstow the effect was becoming evident, and at Albuquerque the next morning started to become a disaster, as over a thousand employees in no way on strike will be laid off on the 15th. At La Junta, over 300 will be laid off, and at Newton several hundred, with smaller layoffs at intermediate points. Albuquerque is a city of about 90,000 and is entirely without railroad-freight service, and as you know, one of the all-important defense works is in that immediate vicinity. This strike would be ridiculous if it was not so serious, and probably the next thing you will hear of will be that the chair-car porters will go on strike for at least two men to a car, establish a picket line and tie up the country's rail transportation. The railroad brotherhoods were the first pressure group to bluff the Government into passing

special-class legislation for their special benefit when the Adamson Act was passed in 1917. At that time the late E. P. Ripley said that the action of Congress in letting anyone bluff them into special legislation in the face of a national emergency would plague this country as long as we existed, and I guess he was right. This can no longer be a one-way street and if the brotherhoods insist on accepting only Government benefits without thought of their responsibility to the public, some action will have to be taken by Congress to insure such protection as the right to strike has now gone beyond all reason. Anyone who says a national emergency is not being created, must be crazy. One of the things that alarms me most is the apathy with which the general public and affected communities accept such high-handed abuse. I fear we are losing our fighting spirit.

E. C. MORIARTY.

EFFECT OF THE RAILROAD STRIKE ON CALIFORNIA CROPS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD two telegrams I have received from growers' organizations in California pointing out the serious and adverse effect the railroad strike is now having on the crops that are coming into the harvest at the present time in California, and what the ultimate effects will be if the strike is continued.

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

SAN JOSE, CALIF., May 14, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We as growers and shipper of 3,000 cars fresh fruits and vegetables yearly and now in peak of production being shipped interstate, strongly urge you use every means within your office to bring the present unjustified railroad strike to termination immediately, otherwise we and the entire vegetable and fruit industry face severe losses and possible crop disaster account of inadequate service and increasingly shortage of refrigerator cars for loading on nonstriking railroads.

DARRIGO BROS. CO. OF CALIFORNIA.

BRAWLEY, CALIF., May 13, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The harvesting of the highly perishable Imperial Valley cantaloupes, watermelons, tomatoes now under way. It cannot be delayed. A total railroad strike would deprive great many people who follow vegetable harvest of an important part of their yearly wage. Also a year's work, money, and effort has gone into these perishable crops. We respectfully request and know you will do all possible to facilitate settlement railroad strike.

JACK BROS. & MCBURNEY, INC.

POOLING OF HEAVY INDUSTRIES OF FRANCE AND GERMANY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I issued to the press on May 12.

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

The announcement by the French Government of its decision to pool the heavy industries of France and Germany looks like the best news to come out of Europe since

the ending of World War II insofar as the prevention of world war III is concerned.

It is obviously a great thing from a political and a military standpoint and, if it does not mean a new European cartel, it should be a splendid step forward in the economic sense. Taken in conjunction with the North Atlantic Pact it should give new life to the idea of building a group of nations in western Europe which are strong not only economically, but militarily as well.

It gives new hope and new confidence—and happily, hope and confidence can snowball just as effectively as can suspicion and fear.

Basing my opinion entirely on the news reports and without having yet had time to read the document, it appears clear to me that this is a proposal which the United States should support enthusiastically, and I am glad the Secretary of State has done so.

The French statesmen are entitled to congratulations for their courage and creative political spirit.

WAIVING OF PAYMENT OF DUTY ON CERTAIN IMPORTATIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1555, House Joint Resolution 466, which the House has passed without dissent, and which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Finance. It permits the importation without the payment of tariff charges of certain articles from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the first United States International Trade Fair, in Chicago. If the articles are kept in this country for more than 3 months, they become subject to duty. If they are sold, they become subject to duty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 466) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is the kind of measure which the junior Senator from Nebraska had suggested the Senate ought to consider even though the motion to consider the FEPC bill is pending before the Senate. I made the statement on the floor that I thought only privileged matters should come up during debate on FEPC proposal. However, the joint resolution should be considered immediately, in order that exhibitors may be assured that there will be no tariff charged on their exhibits, unless they decide to sell them or keep them in the country more than 90 days. The provisions of the joint resolution have been narrowed considerably from the bill in which the junior Senator from Illinois was interested some time ago. I understand the bill has been reported unanimously, and the junior Senator from Nebraska is glad to join the Senator from Georgia in having the joint resolution considered at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Its application has been narrowed to this one exhibition at

Chicago, which is to open early in August.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FILING OF CLOTURE PETITION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the announcement made on Friday last by the majority leader [Mr. Lucas], I ask unanimous consent to address an inquiry to the acting majority leader as to whether or not it is now the intention of the majority to file a cloture petition on the pending motion to consider the FEPC bill on Wednesday of this week. The majority leader announced that if some arrangement could not be made to bring up the bill for debate, it was his probable intention to file a cloture petition on Wednesday.

My reason for the request is that if such action is to be taken, I should like to know it and be able to announce the program to all Senators on this side of the aisle, and see that they are present Friday to vote on the cloture petition.

Mr. MYERS. It is my understanding that the majority leader announced definitely that he would not file the petition before Wednesday, but that it would probably be filed Wednesday, to be voted on Friday. I think the Senator is safe in announcing to the Senators on his side of the aisle that no cloture petition will be filed before Wednesday.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the intention that the petition shall be filed on Wednesday?

Mr. MYERS. My understanding is that it is the intention to file the petition on Wednesday.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS—TELEGRAM TO HERBERT HOOVER BY SENATOR TOBEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous consent agreement of Friday last the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, if I may do so without prejudice to my right to the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I desire to read a telegram which I am today dispatching to the Honorable Herbert Hoover, as follows:

HERBERT HOOVER:

On February 15, 1949, I voluntarily took a national radio hookup to support Hoover Commission reports. This speech, entitled "Curbing the Octopus" attracted favorable national response, particularly in State of New Hampshire, where I distributed thousands of copies in effort to marshal public support for your outstanding work, and a personal letter of appreciation from you. I might add, parenthetically, that a special session of the New Hampshire State Legislature is currently and successfully making a sweeping reorganization of that State's gov-

ernment acting under the recommendations of Gov. Sherman Adams and a fine bipartisan commission. This action has overwhelming public support in my State and my personal endorsement as an individual voter there. This, I believe, is an indication of what can be accomplished when an alerted and informed public opinion speaks out. In my opinion the efficient reorganization of the Federal Government, in line with your recommendations, faces an acute crisis. Group after group has sponsored resolutions of disapproval for specific reorganization plans submitted by the President under Reorganization Act of 1949. According to the Washington Star of May 14, the members of the powerful transportation lobby have forgotten individual competitive infighting long enough to combine to defeat plans of reorganization Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Maritime Commission, and others. This and other groups insist these and other reorganization plans "not in line with Hoover Commission recommendations," "establish dictators of Commission chairman;" "delegate powers of Congress to the Executive." Not to be confused with these lobbies, individual industrialists of my State, men of highest integrity and perspicacity have written me to vote against several reorganization plans.

There are many busy members of United States Senate such as myself who are not members of Executive Expenditures Committee and hence not in position to determine fine points of these arguments. It is imperative in the interest of efficient government and increased economy, that you speak out specifically and unequivocally on the reorganization plans coming to vote in Senate this week. Are the arguments raised by these special groups and individuals valid or are they a further case of "reorganize everybody else but me." Troubled and busy Senators such as myself who can and will vote independently and resolutely in the public interest and not at the beck and call of special groups need your unqualified answer. Time and the opportunity to implement the reports of your Commission are slipping away and the climate to reorganize is daily growing more unfavorable under the incessant hammering of these special groups, both within and without the Government.

I appeal to you to speak out in clarion tones to cap your distinguished public career which, in its humanitarian aspects and length of public service, is without parallel in this country. I am prepared to go down the line for well-thought-out and specific views expressed by you at this time.

CHARLES W. TOBEY.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE PROPOSED FREEDOM FAIR

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, when things go wrong and when failures occur, it is a human weakness to try to place the blame on the other fellow. It is rare indeed when a person has the courage to be fair enough and big enough to take the blame himself.

The failure of the proposed Freedom Fair has been laid at the doorstep of Congress by some people. One noncongressional member of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission has been quoted by the press as saying:

It's unfortunate the Eightieth Congress (which passed the Sesqui Act) didn't give us the tools to work with.

It is gratifying that another noncongressional member of the Commission has taken issue with that statement, which seeks to place the blame on Con-

gress, and in challenging that statement has countered with the statement that—

It seems to me that both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses gave everything they were asked to give, and the lack of legislative authority to proceed with the Freedom Fair must be charged to the Commission itself.

Mr. Joseph C. McGarraghy, chairman of the executive committee of the Commission, displayed admirable fairness and rare courage to resist the human weakness of blaming the other fellow. He backed up his statement in a letter of May 11, 1950, to Mr. Carter Barron. As an ex officio member of the Commission, I agree with Mr. McGarraghy, and I commend his fairness.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter to Mr. Barron, a copy of which was sent to me without comment, be inserted in the RECORD to keep the record straight on the ill-fated Freedom Fair.

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

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., May 11, 1950.

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Enclosed is copy of my letter of today to Mr. Barron which is self-explanatory.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. MCGARRAGHY.

MAY 11, 1950.

MR. CARTER T. BARRON,
Executive Vice Chairman, National
Capital Sesquicentennial Commission,
Loew's Capitol Theater, Wash-
ington, D. C.

DEAR CARTER: Today's issue of the Washington Post contains the following quotation attributed to you:

"It's unfortunate the Eightieth Congress (which passed the Sesqui Act) didn't give us the tools to work with."

This quotation, which is along the general line of other comments which have appeared in the press from time to time, makes it important, it seems to me, that the record be kept straight regarding the legislative history.

In the latter part of 1946 a meeting of citizens was held in the United States Chamber of Commerce Building, pursuant to call of the Washington Building Congress at which it was voted to create a committee to sponsor legislation for appropriate commemoration of the sesquicentennial.

As a result of that meeting a Citizen's Sesqui-Centennial Committee was organized of which you, Mr. Fleming, and I were members. There was a total membership of 15.

The committee met on December 27, 1946, and elected officers. The committee then considered draft of a bill as submitted by General Grant. It was decided to refer the matter to a subcommittee of three to put the bill in final form. The subcommittee consisted of Messrs. Frederic P. Lee, Christopher B. Garnett, and Charles H. Tompkins. The first two named are well-known lawyers.

This subcommittee prepared a revised draft of the bill and thereafter the Citizens' Committee submitted it to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the request that the Commissioners sponsor the legislation.

The proposed bill was considered at a meeting of the Board of Commissioners on January 21, 1947, and on January 30, 1947, the Commissioners wrote the committee that

they "endorse the plan outlined in the proposed bill." They then proposed certain minor changes in the draft but still not changing any of the essential features.

My files indicate that on February 4, 1947, as chairman of the citizens' committee, I advised each member of the action of the Commissioners (my file contains carbon copy of my letter of that date addressed to you.) Thereafter we arranged to have the bill introduced in the Eightieth Congress and it was enacted by that Congress in the terms recommended by the committee.

I am certain that at no time during the discussion of the proposed legislation was there any mentioned of a Freedom Fair and it does seem to me that we subject ourselves to proper criticism when we criticize the Eightieth Congress for failure to give us the tools to work with when the fact is that the Congress enacted precisely the legislation requested.

As you know, the legislation creating the Sesquicentennial Commission as passed by the Eightieth Congress was not intended to and did not do more than set up the Commission which would report to the Congress and seek further enabling legislation. If there was any failure of the Congress to give us the tools to work with, it seems to me that we should look to the further enabling legislation which was enacted by the Eighty-first Congress. However, here again I do not see how the Congress can be blamed, for the fact is that the further enabling legislation which was passed by the Eighty-first Congress was in accordance with the request of the Commission which had then come into being and, if the Commission failed to include in its proposed legislation adequate tools to put on a Freedom Fair, we certainly cannot blame the Congress for failure to provide the tools.

Of course, the further fact is that the idea of a Freedom Fair was not discussed by the Commission until the meeting of the Commission held at the White House on April 15, 1949, when the plans were unveiled for the first time. Since the further enabling legislation had been drafted prior to that meeting and actually was embodied in joint resolutions introduced by Senator McGrath and Mrs. NORRAN on March 22, 1949, I do not think we can criticize the Eighty-first Congress for failure in that resolution to provide the tools to execute a program subsequently brought forward.

I think the record should be kept straight that the original legislation creating the Sesquicentennial Commission was passed in the form requested by the Citizens' Committee at which time there had been no expressions about a Freedom Fair.

It seems to me that both the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congress gave everything they were asked to give and the lack of legislative authority to proceed with the Freedom Fair must be charged to the Commission itself.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the other members of the executive committee.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. MCGARRAGHY.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

FRIENDS AND OPPONENTS OF CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, provided it does not have the effect of taking me off the floor or of interfering in any way with my position.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] may yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan at this time, with that understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in connection with the debate on the FEPC, I merely desire to make a few remarks this morning. I think it will be found interesting if I show what is currently going on in connection with that measure. Mr. Truman, on his "nonpolitical" whistle-stop tour of the West of course advised the people that he and his party were all for the civil-rights program. He insisted that they are a unit upon that particular program. Difficulty is apparently being experienced in maintaining that unity. A sort of round-table discussion took place in Chicago yesterday on the subject, and in the Baltimore Sun, Mr. Thomas O'Neill gives an account of it. What he has to say I think clearly demonstrates there is great difficulty keeping the wraps around this united program, and I think it clearly shows what is going to happen in the Senate regarding FEPC.

I have been in the Senate but a short time, this being my second term. During my first term, I had occasion to serve on a steering committee which sought to have considered the anti-poll-tax bill and certain other so-called civil-rights bills. The distinguished Senator from New York at that time, Mr. Mead, was on that committee. We could never get to first base in our effort to have the Senate consider those bills, and I think the real facts of the situation are coming to light now.

The two distinguished Senators from Alabama have stated their positions on the civil-rights program, describing the unity which exists on the subject within the Democratic Party. I think the public should realize exactly what is happening. From the Baltimore Sun, let me read the following:

Most of those in attendance at the civil-rights panel departed early and missed the high spot. That was the unscheduled appearance of a southern member of the Democratic National Committee to take issue vigorously with the long list of scheduled speakers who had all solemnly declared the need for immediate enactment of the fair-employment-practices bill now up in the Senate.

DANIELS REFUSES TO SWERVE

The unexpected voice was that of Jonathan Daniels, of Raleigh, N. C., who was formerly a White House aide to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and is a recognized leader of liberal political forces in the South.

Repeated attempts were made by the authorities in charge of the program to dissuade Daniels. Among those who took him aside for earnest solicitations in the name of party harmony—

I repeat, "in the name of party harmony" trying to deceive the American people. Who were those persons?

Among those who took him aside for earnest solicitations in the name of party harmony were Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and Mrs. India Edwards, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Daniels would not be turned aside by soft discourse.

Other means of discouraging him were tried. The panel chairman, Senator GREEN, Democrat, Rhode Island, called 18 speakers, some of them unusually voluble, while Daniels squirmed and sent repeated messages to the presiding officer.

VOTED FOR TRUMAN

At the end, beyond the hour when the committee had agreed to relinquish the meeting room in the the Sherman Hotel, Senator GREEN announced:

"I had hoped to have time for a question period. Most of the questions you would have asked, I believe, have already been answered in the statements made.

"One gentleman, however, asked me some time ago to call on him. I feel I must let him have a few minutes."

Mr. President, after taking all this time and thinking they had unity on this question wrapped up, what do they do in the great thriving city of Chicago? They try by every possible means to deceive the public as to the unity of the Democrats on this great issue now before the Senate.

I want to quote from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. In a recent speech in Alabama the Senator from Alabama said:

Some seem to think that the Republicans are our friends in defeating civil-rights proposals. Such is simply not the case.

We hear on the floor, we read in the newspapers that there is a bloc of northern Republicans and southern Democrats out to defeat FEPC legislation and other civil-rights bills, such as antilynching bills and anti-poll-tax bills. There is nothing further from the truth. Let me read the authority for my statement that there is nothing further from the truth than the statement that here is such a bloc of northern Republicans and southern Democrats. It comes from a member of the bloc of southern Democratic Senators who might well like to see a coalition with anyone on this question. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is still speaking, and I quote:

I have before me an AP news item of April 12, the headline of which tells the story. I quote: "Republicans Demand Act on FEPC."

In recent months a civil-rights amendment has been offered to three different measures, all important to the South. In each instance the amendment was offered by a Republican Senator, and in each instance the Republicans voted strongly for the amendment, and the Democrats, northern and southern alike, voted against it.

Mr. President, ever since I have been in the Senate, civil-rights bills have been defeated as the result of combinations of northern Democrats and southern Democrats, and not northern Republicans and southern Democrats.

Let me now read a statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]:

If our group of southern Senators is to continue to defeat these civil-rights bills, we must keep the power and influence we hold as members of the Democratic Party.

I repeat: "of the Democratic Party."

We know the Republican history of the civil-rights bills. When the people of the Second Alabama District first sent me to Congress some 25 years ago, the House of Representatives was engaged in a fight over the antilynching bill. It was a Republican bill, just as the antilynching bill on the calendar of the Senate today is a Republican bill, introduced by the Republican Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The Republican Party brought the civil-rights bills into being, and today the Republican leader in the House and the Republican leader in the Senate proclaim the Republican Party's solemn commitment to these bills.

Mr. President, this language and what happened in Chicago, should spike forever the statement that there is a conspiracy between northern Republicans and southern Democrats. The real conspiracy, Mr. President, is between northern Democrats and southern Democrats. Behind the scenes they are doing, and for years past have done, everything they can to defeat civil-rights legislation.

Mr. President, I ask that excerpts from the addresses by the Senators from Alabama be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The extracts from the addresses by Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN are as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The following excerpts are from speeches made over State-wide radio hookups on April 12-17 by Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN J. SPARKMAN of Alabama:

I. SENATOR LISTER HILL, MONTGOMERY, ALA., APRIL 12, 1950

"I am a States' Rights Democrat. I have fought the battle of States' rights. I have kept the faith. I tell you it is the power and influence of your Senators and Congressmen that has made possible the defeat of FEPC and the other so-called civil-rights bills. They hold this power and influence as members of the Democratic Party.

"The anti-poll-tax bill is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee. Senator JOHN C. STENNIS of Mississippi is chairman of this subcommittee because of his membership in the Democratic Party. If he were a member of a Dixiecrat splinter party he could not be chairman of this committee or any other committee. He could have little influence in the fight against the civil-rights bills.

"The general civil-rights bill is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator JIM EASTLAND of Mississippi is chairman of this subcommittee because of his membership in the Democratic Party. If he were not a Democrat he could not be chairman of this committee or any other committee.

"As a Democrat, I hold a place on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I led the fight in the committee against the FEPC bill, and the committee dropped the bill like a foundling on the Senate's doorstep—without a word in its favor.

"We know the Republican history of the civil-rights bills. When the people of the Second Alabama District first sent me to Congress some 25 years ago, the House of Representatives was engaged in a fight over the antilynching bill. It was a Republican bill, just as the antilynching bill on the calendar of the Senate today is a Republican bill, introduced by the Republican Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

"The Republican Party brought the civil-rights bills into being and today the Republican leader in the House and the Republican leader in the Senate proclaim the Re-

publican Party's solemn commitment to these bills.

"If our group of southern Senators is to continue to defeat these civil-rights bills, we must keep the power and influence we hold as members of the Democratic Party.

"We cannot put off this decision. We live in the Democratic Party every day in the year. We meet our problems day by day—as Democrats. We won the fight for our cotton and peanut farmers—as Democrats. We hold the line against the civil-rights bills—as Democrats."

II. SENATOR JOHN J. SPARKMAN, MOBILE, ALA., APRIL 17, 1950

"There are some things about the Democratic Party that I do not like; some parts of the platform that I will not accept; some of the legislative program that I will not support. We do not have to sacrifice any of our convictions. I am against the civil-rights proposals—always have been and always will be. One of the first votes I cast upon going to Congress 14 years ago was against one of these bills. Almost every year since then I have voted against such proposals.

"To listen to some of those who would lead us into a splinter party, one would think that the civil-rights proposals were first made in 1948. They have been coming up with consistent regularity since shortly after the Civil War. During the time I have been in Congress I have voted against them more than a dozen times. In the 1890's, Alabama's great Democratic Senator John T. Morgan led a successful filibuster against such legislation proposed by Republicans to punish the South.

"The platforms of both great parties for many, many years have carried similar proposals for so-called civil-rights legislation. Every platform upon which Franklin D. Roosevelt ran contained such proposals—and Alabama gladly supported Roosevelt without question.

"By the way, we southern Democrats had the chance to have the same language on civil rights, almost word for word, in the 1948 platform as was in the Roosevelt platform in 1944. I can say that the decision was Alabama's to make. I was in the hotel meeting of the Alabama delegation that hot Sunday afternoon when the proposal was made. But unfortunately, half of our delegates had gone to that convention determined to walk out and they were determined that nothing should happen to keep them from walking out. So they refused to accept the 1944 version and thereby brought about the fight in the convention that resulted in the more objectionable language in the platform. They took the position that they would not play unless they could write every single rule. That is the attitude that the Dixiecrats are taking today. You and I know that games are not played that way.

"Even though the Democratic platform, as well as the Republican, carried a pledge for civil-rights legislation, no such law has been enacted. And I predict that if you do not take away from us who represent you in Congress the power that is ours as long as we can operate as Democrats—on the inside—there will not be any such legislation.

"After all civil-rights legislation is not defeated by Dixiecrat maneuvers in Alabama nor by threats of the formation of a splinter party. In the past it has always been defeated on the floor of the Senate. There and there alone must we look for its defeat in the future.

"We southern Democratic Senators—21 of us—are banded together and pledged to use every parliamentary device possible to defeat civil-rights legislation. And listen to this: Every single one of those 21 southern Democratic Senators believes that we should stay in the Democratic Party. We know

what our most important weapon is. It is the ability to work as Democrats.

"Some seem to think that the Republicans are our friends in defeating civil-rights proposals. Such is simply not the case. I have before me an AP news item of April 12, the headline of which tells the story. I quote: 'Republicans demand act on FEPC.'

"In recent months a civil-rights amendment has been offered to three different measures, all important to the South. In each instance the amendment was offered by a Republican Senator and in each instance the Republicans voted strongly for the amendment and the Democrats—northern and southern alike—voted against.

"On a Republican proposal to tie civil rights to Federal aid for education, not a single Democrat voted for it. On the Republican proposal to tie civil rights to housing, the Republicans voted almost solidly for it while only three Democrats voted that way. A similar Republican attempt to tie civil rights to oleo tax repeal bill was strongly supported by Republicans, but opposed unanimously by Democrats.

"Let us never for one moment be fooled into thinking that we can depend on Republicans help to defeat these measures.

"I repeat: We must depend upon our group of 21 southern Senators operating as Democrats inside the Democratic Party.

"Alabama has much to lose in getting out of the Democratic Party."

Mr. WHERRY. What is the date of the Hill release?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is April 12, 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the date of the Sparkman release?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is April 17, 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. They were both released prior to the Democratic primaries.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I think it was very significant that we were unable to get the pending bill on FEPC to the floor before the Florida and Alabama primaries. It did not come up for weeks. The same difficulty has so far stymied my antilynching bill, which has been on the Senate Calendar and ready for vote since last June, almost a full year. It is always being put off.

Now we see this spectacle in Chicago yesterday. What were they trying to do? They were trying to show the Democrats that there was unity among all Democrats to pass the bill. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee did not want Mr. Jonathan Daniels to upset the apple cart by revealing to the people the real truth as to what goes on within the Democratic Party.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the argument could not go a step further in order to show that, so far from there being a Democrat-Republican bloc, the Republicans generally have not voted for anything that would help the South.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the South has done pretty well in connection with appropriations, if that means anything in reply to the question. I say there is no conspiracy between northern Republicans and southern Democrats in connection with civil-rights legislation.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not a fact that the majority of the Republicans voted for a bill providing for Federal aid to education, under which two-thirds of the money was to go to the Southeastern States?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I do not think the Republican votes, on the average, have been against the South, where the national interest is to be served.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the meeting in Chicago yesterday was televised.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And there was a very flickery result. Does the Senator from Michigan know whether the unusual flickering of the television set yesterday was due to the fact that the Cabinet members were trying to occupy several positions at the same time, or were they just jittery?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it was the natural result of a Cabinet member jumping from one side of an issue to the other, inevitably causing a flickering result in the television broadcast. Or it may have been merely the uncertain character of that supposed Cabinet meeting that was being televised.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I just heard from Chicago that the unfortunate result of the Cabinet meeting yesterday, when only a third of the seats were filled, was because the good people of Chicago preferred a good baseball game to a phony Cabinet meeting, the sense of which they detected.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not blame them for attending a real baseball game instead of a phony meeting in which an effort was made to make the people think it was a genuine Cabinet meeting. I am really disappointed that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] has not asked that the sessions of the United States Senate be taken to Chicago and televised. I think it would be well to show the public, through the debate, what is really going on.

It will be noted that an unusual technique was used at the meeting in Chicago. Everyone had gone home except a few newspapermen, and that is why we see the headline in the Baltimore Sun which announced, "Chicago gives cold shoulder to the Democrats."

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the remark made by the Senator from Louisiana, which I would not want to be permitted to stand unchallenged, does the Senator, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, recall in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Eightieth Congress, or the Eighty-first Congress, when certain matters came before the committee, that there was any partisanship

shown or any discrimination shown against the South or any other part of the country in dealing with projects which came before the committee? As a matter of fact, does not the record show that the South has been equitably treated, along with other sections of the Nation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that they have been very equitably treated.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In order to have the record straight, I think it should show that the aid of distinguished Republicans in voting for Federal aid to education amounted to nothing, because the bill has not been enacted, and probably will not be enacted.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether or not the distinguished Senator is aware that the Representative from North Carolina who has charge of that bill in the House is a member of the majority party. Is the Senator claiming that Republicans have not voted to report the bill?

Mr. LONG. Nevertheless, it is true that the Republican support of the aid to education is sound and fury, signifying nothing, because the South has not and probably will not receive any aid from the Federal-aid-to-education bill.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. We put that bill through the 80th Congress and through the 81st Congress, and it has been held up and defeated on a religious dispute between two Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, Mr. LESINSKI, of Michigan, and Mr. BARDEN, of North Carolina. They introduced a religious question into it which did not belong in the consideration of the bill. Certainly if anyone is to blame for that failure, it is the Democratic members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. In view of what my personal friend, the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] has said—and I consider him my very good personal friend, because I like the young man very much, and I have served with him on committee—I wish to remind him, while he is speaking of what has been done for the South and what has not been done for the South, that prior to the legislation which was enacted in 1949 only six agricultural commodities were under mandatory support, and of those commodities four were what might be considered crops of the deep South, namely, tobacco, rice, peanuts, and cotton. If the Senator should ever have a feeling that his area of the country has been neglected, I should like to have him think very seriously about those four crops, which have mandatory support.

I should like him to consider, also, that such great agricultural activities, as dairying, livestock, and poultry never

had mandatory support until last year, when we succeeded in getting mandatory support of from 75 percent to 90 percent only on dairy products. So I ask the Senator not to become sectional. Let us not talk about what we do for one part of the United States and what we do not do for another part of the United States. I would rather think in terms of the whole United States. I would rather think in terms of our country than in terms of groups, classes, or sections. However, if the Senator wishes to refer to what the South has not had done for it, or what the South has had done for it, I believe we can show that some Senators from the South have represented their States so splendidly that people of the North might well criticize us Senators from that section because we have not done so well for them as the Senators from the South have been able to do in behalf of the people of their States.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I fully agree with my friends on the Republican side that appropriations should be made on a bipartisan basis and that all sections of the country should share in them. However, it seems to me that there is no use of the Republican side trying to blow both hot and cold at the same time. The Senator from Michigan said that Republicans have never helped us on civil-rights legislation. We might go a step further and say that, so far as I know, there has been no great effort on the part of the Republicans to help the South on anything. If they wish to claim that they have worked with us, I would be interested in hearing about it. I should like to know in what way the Republicans have helped the South.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Louisiana obviously believes they have not, but that is beside the point. I should like only to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether he agrees with the senior Senator and junior Senator from Alabama on what they had to say, to the effect that the defeat of civil-rights legislation had to be brought about within the Democratic Party. Their statements, and the leadership's record of keeping the FEPC bill from the floor until after the primary in Florida and then attempting to have it considered clearly reveal the sham in the Democratic Party on this issue.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator is asking me whether I agree with the distinguished Senators from Alabama—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina rose.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I ask my question of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only. I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator asks me whether I agree with the speeches made by the Senators from Alabama, I merely wish to say that I agree with a great portion of the logic expressed in those speeches. I might add that they not

only say the Republican Party had not helped the South on civil-rights legislation, but went on to show that the Republican Party had not helped the South on anything. I agree with them on that, too.

Mr. FERGUSON. Although they do not dispute my basic contention, to accommodate the Senator from Louisiana I shall put the entire speeches in the RECORD, so that Senators may read them, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The speeches by Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether my 10 minutes have expired.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not intend to become involved in any sectional argument. I try to avoid sectional arguments as much as possible. I have no apology to make for having voted with or against Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle on any occasion. I try to vote my convictions on issues as I see them. However, in view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] I should not like the RECORD to be closed without pointing out that the four crops to which the Senator referred as being southern crops are the only four crops which are under penalties of acreage allotments and marketing quotas. So that at least our farmers bear that burden, which is not borne by the producers of other commodities.

In view of the motion which is now pending before the Senate, I derive much amusement from the present discussion. One thing has always puzzled me, and I should like to have the able Senator from Michigan answer a question for me.

When southern Senators vote with Republicans on any issue, as we have done on occasion, it is referred to as a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats with the inference such a combination is most sinful. I also read something else which was said yesterday by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] in a speech at Chicago. He beat the drums and summoned to his colors all Republicans and urged them to vote in favor of cloture on the FEPC bill. It has always puzzled me considerably why it is called a coalition when a few southern Democrats assert their independent judgment and vote with Republicans, but when Republicans combine with northern Democrats, as the Senator from Illinois invited them to do, it is referred to as a great and holy bipartisan movement. [Laughter.] If the Senator from Michigan can make a distinction for me, I should like to have him do so, because it has always been a matter of great bewilderment to me. It is an unholy coalition when we vote with Republicans. On the other hand, the Democratic leadership never shows any hesitancy in summoning Republicans to join Democrats in a great bipartisan movement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I can clear up the question for the able Senator. I, too, have been amused and even amazed by the comments about "holy" and "unholy" alliances. But I haven't been bewildered, and the public should not. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have seen northern Democrats use that "unholy alliance" expression to hoodwink northern voters. It is just what I am talking about today. It is why I am making this nonpolitical speech today. I think it is time that we answered some of these nonpolitical speeches, which are now being made in various places. The only thing I miss is the whistle. If I had a whistle I might get up more steam. Mr. President, the term "coalition between the North and the South" is used to deceive northern voters, no more, no less. That is what was attempted in Chicago yesterday, at some pains but not with complete success. Mr. Daniels, the national committee member, just would not be kept silent. He wanted to tell what has been going on.

Just remember this: back in the days when the Senate had only 16 Republican Members and when the House of Representatives had only 80 Republican Members, this same civil-rights program was possible of ready enactment. It was used then, as it is now, by the northern Democrats to get votes in the North, with no intention on their part of passing any such legislation. That is the whole point of the incidents in Chicago yesterday, and the shadow-boxing by the Democratic Party through the years on this issue of civil rights.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to call attention to one sentence in the remarks made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which reads as follows:

We must depend on our group of 21 southern Senators operating—

I underline that—
as Democrats inside the Democratic Party.

I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan whether, when the chips are down and a vote is taken, the Republican votes in favor of the measure are not likely to be considerably in excess of the Democratic votes? Is it not true that perhaps 80 or 90 percent of the Republican votes will be in favor of the proposed legislation, and that certainly if 50 percent of the Democrats' votes are in favor of it the Democrats will be doing well? Is there any doubt, when the roll is called up yonder, as to what will be found? [Laughter.]

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we will find what the Senator has indicated on any roll call, today, tomorrow, or hereafter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to say that while I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator's nonpolitical speech—

Mr. FERGUSON. Whistle-stop speech.

Mr. RUSSELL. He still leaves me thinking it is a distinction without a difference in the even constant reference to a coalition when some southern Democrats vote with the Republicans, or vice versa, but perfectly proper when the administration desires Republican votes to

appeal to the Republicans to join them in a bipartisan crusade.

Mr. FERGUSON. I conclude that it is "bunk." That is just what the administration is giving to the people of the United States—"the bunk."

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

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from South Carolina is willing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The question the Senator from Georgia raised makes one believe that the able majority leader of the Senate has been enunciating a new "guilt by association" doctrine, namely, that so long as the southern Democrats vote regularly with the Democratic Party it is a very fine thing; but if any of them happen to vote with the Republicans, there is guilt by association. [Laughter.] I am not quite sure as to which the guilty party is, according to the lights of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. The majority leader also appeals to the Republicans to come over and join him, thereby making him guilty by association [laughter], on the motion to take up the FEPC bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for the 10 minutes he yielded me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, beginning where I left off last Friday, and continuing my nonpolitical speech discussing FEPC, I am going to take a few minutes to make some observations about what took place on the floor of the Senate a few minutes ago.

I noticed that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made reference to the Republican Party trying to claim credit for the possibility of the passing of the FEPC bill. I desire to take credit for attempting to kill the bill, and call to the attention of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from California just what has taken place in regard to similar measures in their States. I note the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is now present on the Senate floor. In California a similar bill was submitted to the voters; and the people of California voted upon that issue. Those voting in favor of it were 675,697, and 1,682,646 voted against it. The vote in California was almost 3 to 1 when the people voted upon that issue. I thought I would call attention to what happened in that particular State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the figures from the State of California on the FEPC referendum?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The people of California voted 675,697 for the bill. Voting against it were 1,682,646. It was defeated by more than a million majority in California.

Mr. LONG. That was about a 2 to 1 vote against it, was it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was better than that; it was about 2½ to 1.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the Legislature of Illinois the house passed a similar bill, and it went to the

senate, and the senate voted it down. I believe the Republicans have a majority in the senate in Illinois. They voted 25 to 23 in Illinois in the State of the majority leader.

In North Dakota a similar bill passed the house but died in the senate. All these figures apply to what happened last year.

In Ohio a similar bill died in conference after a close vote in the house, 70 to 61.

Mr. President, I am repeating these figures to indicate that there is not merely an effort of the southern people to defeat this bill, but the people throughout the Nation are against it when they properly understand it.

I do not believe any party should claim any credit in relation to it. I know that in my own State I do not want to claim any credit for it, and I do not intend to do so. I am giving warning here and now that, so far as the South is concerned, there will be another crisis, just as much of a crisis as was Pearl Harbor when the Second World War was started, if an attempt is made to put such a bill into effect.

Mr. President, a similar bill was killed in Pennsylvania in April 1949. The vote in the senate of the legislature was 35 to 15.

Let no one attempt to say that only southerners are against the bill.

Something was said a few minutes ago to the effect that this bill should have been brought before the Senate prior to the primary election in Florida. I wonder why that statement was made. Was it because those favoring it did not want the people to express themselves on it immediately before the vote? That is the only thing I could gather from the statement.

Proceeding to a discussion of the bill, Mr. President, nearly every day some Senator rises on the Senate floor and complains to high heaven that some "little bureaucrat," as he calls him, has added a few dozen more obnoxious controls and restrictions over the social and economic lives of the people. Yet almost every one of such restrictions and controls has stemmed from direct congressional authorization or from laws drawn so generally as to give Federal agencies carte blanche to do almost anything they desire in order to achieve policy ends. When Washington says to an American citizen that in his private business he may or may not hire an applicant for employment, he naturally and instinctively rebels. Accordingly, a solemn obligation is imposed on every person whose voice may contribute to, or result in the enactment of the proposed legislation to pause a little and weigh the consequences of such a law. Law after law has been enacted in which broad powers have been given and abused, and Members of Congress, to escape the condemnations, protestations, and vituperations of their constituents have blamed the agencies of the executive branch because they did precisely what Congress in terms authorized them to do. The bar of history knows no such excuses. Statutes should be passed under the theory of not only what will be done, but also what may be done

under them. Therefore, it behooves us not to create the opportunities for the growth of little cells of totalitarianism, which in the aggregate amount to state socialism, plus a Federal police state. The blame would rest properly upon Congress if Congress created the opportunity for such result for what ensued.

It is apparent that the proponents of the legislation are not interested in the welfare, well-being, and success of the minority races in the Southern States, but that they are directing the legislation at the South for political purposes. They are simply using the Negro in the South as a political football.

I venture to assert that the vote of a Negro in New York, Illinois, or Michigan is worth 100 times as much as a white vote in South Carolina. Why do I make that statement? Because both political parties are fighting for the Negro vote in certain districts in New York, in certain districts in Illinois, in certain districts in Michigan. It is not so in South Carolina. The reason why it is not so in South Carolina is that in the November election the State is certain to go Democratic. It is hardly necessary to go to the polls to vote, because everyone knows what the result will be. But in States where the results are very close between the Democrats and the Republicans, there is a pulling and a hauling with all the strength each side can exert to get the Negro vote on its side. That results in stirring up the Negro question very greatly. There is no question about that, Mr. President. Every sensible man knows it to be so. It is for that reason I have supported and voted for a law which would provide for a change in election of President and Vice President. The effect of such a law would be a pro rata division of representation in the electoral vote; if one party received 51 percent of the total vote it would have a 51 percent electoral representation; if the other party received 49 percent of the vote it would have a 49 percent of the electoral vote. The result would be that the two parties would not be fighting so hard to secure a majority in order to obtain the total number of electoral votes of the State. To a certain extent it would result in lessening the fight for the votes of the minority group.

I stated on the floor of the Senate on February 1, 1950:

We, in the South, highly resent the fact that both parties will spend a hundred times as much money to get the Negro vote in Harlem and that the vote of a Negro there is worth a hundred times as much on the national political scene as the vote of a white man or a Negro from South Carolina.

We do not believe it is fair or honest or democratic to place such a high premium on such a few votes because they happen to be from a section in Chicago, Detroit, or New York.

Political parties and political bosses can never resist the temptation of making undue appeals to minority groups whose votes mean the balance of power and the election of Presidents.

The best friend the Negro race has ever had has been the white southerner. That reminds me of a colored man who

had been in the North and while there became unemployed and needed someone to help him. He immediately thought of the South and started to walk back to the South. Finally he ran into a man who treated him like southerners treat the Negro, and the colored man immediately realized that he was drawing near to his destination, to the South. He said to that southerner, "Thank God, I am getting back closer to the South."

I charge that the great majority of the people of the United States are not supporting this proposed legislation and that the meager popular support it receives comes mainly from pressure groups, radical organizations, Communist-front groups, and representatives of minority racial organizations. At that point let me say that Senators will find that all of them are advocating the proposed legislation. I repeat the question I asked on last Friday: Has any Senator found a Communist who was not for the FEPC bill? I have not.

Mr. President, I have opposed and will continue to oppose the FEPC program, which is fostered upon the basis of misunderstanding, or lack of understanding, or not put forward in good faith. Any student of human relations, sociology, or psychology knows that one cannot legislate tolerance and understanding, that one cannot force brotherly love, and that one cannot legislate decency and morals. The Congress cannot force or intimidate human beings, even by threat of prosecution and penalty of imprisonment under law, into having affection or admiration, or even respect for those persons with whom they have no desire to associate. As I have stated before, the problem is not one to be solved by legislative enactment, executive fiat or decree. It is purely and simply a problem of education in understanding and tolerance.

The people of the South have made tremendous progress in the improvement of the race and color situation. I know that during my short time in politics, which has been since 1923, great progress in this regard has been made in South Carolina. This has been done through patient, kind, and helpful treatment of the Negroes within our midst. Stories of violence in the South today, pathetically regrettable though they are, have been grossly exaggerated and distorted beyond their real significance. A few horrible, isolated or infrequent instances of brutality are played up and flashed before the Nation in sensational headlines by the hate mongers who would commercialize on human misery in order to promote their own selfish and often sinister interests. I am certain that the tactics and techniques discernible in a great amount of this scare propaganda have been designed in the past, as they are being dictated today, by the insidious and vicious fascistic and communistic forces at work in the world.

Oh, how Russia today will picture to her people what is taking place here in the United States Senate, telling her people how depressed is a portion of the population of our Nation and how much better off the Russians are. That is the kind of false propaganda the Russian Government spreads.

God knows that America is the place where a man can rise from the ground floor, so to speak, and can reach any office, no matter how high. So I can say that ours is the greatest nation on the face of globe.

Madam President (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair), I know whereof I speak. When I realize my humble beginnings, and then when the people of my State by their popular vote have twice made me their Governor, and then have sent me to the Senate of the United States, I appreciate my country, and I will never say anything which might hinder the progress of this great Nation, which has progressed so rapidly not only in wealth, but, as I see it, intellectually, and at the same time has given to the masses of the people more than any other nation on the globe has given to its people. When I say that, I realize what wages are paid to people in Russia, and I further realize what wages are paid to people in France, and I realize what wages are paid to people even in England. I also realize that under the American system of government, every person in our country is given the right to say whom he will employ, who will operate the looms in his mill, who will be employed in his stores, and to employ only those who best fit into the picture in his establishment and are fitted to keep his business on a paying basis, rather than to cause it go into the red, with the probable result that many persons would be thrown out of employment. Those things should be considered when Senators are discussing this bill, which proposes to change our American way of life.

The United States Senate is recognized as the greatest forum, the most resounding sounding board in all the world, where full, complete, and lengthy discussion and debate can be held without fear and the threat of intimidation. However, Madam President, when it is allowed to become a siren of reeking hatred to stir up race against race, it is a blasphemy before God and man.

So far as concerns trying to do good for a certain race, I am in favor of uplifting that race, but that must be done by education. Madam President, I urge the path of education and tolerance and cooperative understanding, not the way of force and fear. I urge this body to review with honest minds, with clean, clear judgment, and without passion, the progress that has been made, and not to mine the road ahead with dynamite that is certain to explode with great destruction when these opposite viewpoints collide.

No people on the face of the earth have ever had greater rights and greater liberties than our people here in America. These rights and liberties are reserved to our people by the Constitution. The framers of our magnificent and highly practicable Constitution—men of almost divine wisdom and of remarkable vision—sought to establish for the first time a truly democratic legislative process. In drawing up the Constitution, the founding fathers did not forget the long struggle for freedom, or the power from which they had rescued individual

liberty. As we know, that power was the state, represented, successively, by kings and parliaments. To cope with that, they erected a political structure of limited, delegated powers. Among the powers denied to the Federal Government was the power to encroach upon the God-given inalienable liberties of the individual. The very essence of liberty is that the individual be let alone. The basic philosophy of our Constitution is that individual freedom can be maintained only if government is fenced away from it as much as possible. That is why the tenth amendment declares that—

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

In other words, the way to secure these rights is not to interfere with their exercise.

The very objective of the type legislation now proposed is detestable, for it seeks to prohibit and to prevent, by governmental action, any freedom to choose one's associates or coworkers in business, if that choice is based upon considerations of race, religion, color, or national origin. Yet the freedom to choose one's associates because of personal liking and confidence or individual judgment is one of the most essential freedoms of a free citizen, and for decades has been guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The freedom to choose one's associates is essential to a free exercise of the right to earn a livelihood and is likewise essential to a genuine liberty of contract, and to the free pursuit of happiness. Under our great Bill of Rights, any industry is entitled to employ whom it sees fit—employees who can best serve, who are equipped to serve, who can advance according to individual initiative, personality, integrity, and ability. This is our American way of life, the American custom and practice. The intimate relation of employer and employee should never be dictated, regardless of race. We do not want to be dictated to in the matter of social, religious, economic, or any other views. The welfare of our Nation will be at stake if such an absurd legislation is enacted. We who are charged with the operation of this great Government of the United States should resort to sound reason and discretion, and not be blinded by the communistic attempts of a group of radicals.

Therefore, Madam President, FEPC legislation is in direct conflict with these fundamental American purposes. If this proposed legislation is enacted, we might as well kiss individual liberty in America good-bye. Liberty will be destroyed.

FEPC legislation will destroy the right of the individual to choose with whom he will associate; it will destroy the right of an employer to employ whom he will to work for him, it will destroy the right of a worker to work where he will. This forcing of an employer to employ an applicant regardless of the applicant's religion or racial origin destroys both freedom of religion and freedom of contract.

The practice of segregation which exists and has existed in the Southern States for a long period of time is widely approved by whites and Negroes alike as aiding in satisfactory relations between the two races. This practice, which is a part of the social structure, allows employers to use whites for some jobs and Negroes for others. Whites choose to work in some jobs, and the same is true of Negroes. It is impossible to change overnight a system which has been built up over a period of 200 years. This practice was being followed before our Government ever began.

The FEPC proposal is communistic. It means regimentation. Let anyone deny it who will. The FEPC bill is unconstitutional, which will be seen further on, by reference to court decisions.

Communism is based upon the theory of class struggle. The interests of the "working class" are supposed to be different from the interests of everyone else. It is contended that there is irrepressible enmity between the "working class" and everyone else; "the workers" are "the exploited"; the others "the exploiters." The communistic theory demands that "the workers" must engage in "class conflict." They must be convinced that they are being "exploited," and the natural disappointment which almost everyone feels at not having achieved as much as he dreamed, must be fanned into a flame of resentment against "the exploiters." In the United States, they are told they are being robbed of their rights.

Communism has no interest in human rights. It is dedicated to the ruthless suppression of individual rights, as well as to the destruction of any political or social system which respects them. To weaken the unity of a free people, to destroy faith in the integrity of free institutions, Communists have found that agitation for so-called civil rights can pay high dividends. It is perfectly adapted to stirring up conflict, setting race against race, employee against employer, one religious group against another. So Communists and fellow travelers, with pretended pious concern for civil rights, undermine the only free society on earth in which civil rights are really respected. How can FEPC do anything but stir up conflict, when an employer knows that every time he employs someone, he is going to be dragged before a commission, probably, and told, "You ought to employ this fellow," the reason assigned being that the applicant is perhaps an Episcopalian, or perhaps a Baptist. Because Baptists are so numerous in the South, it may be said that Baptists get more than their share, and so other religious groups may complain to high heaven of discrimination. The same thing is true as between Protestants and Catholics, Jews and gentiles. Madam President, do not tell me that such a bill as this would not stir up strife and discontent among all religious elements in America. If religion goes, if our churches go, then our Nation will not be worth a continental penny.

In this effort to subvert us to slavery, the Communists do two things:

First, they plant the seed of class conflict in American life. They blind those they dupe to the great truth that in a free society there is no real conflict of "class interest." It is to the interest of employer and employee alike that business shall prosper. A depression that cuts down production and profit automatically cuts down payrolls and the money in the pay envelope. All alike share in prosperity; all suffer in adversity.

Second, they encourage Government to intrude into the forbidden area of individual liberty, and they condition the people first to accept and then to demand such intrusion. They urge Government interference with individual liberty upon the pretended ground that Government is entering the forbidden area in order to protect it, just as Hitler in 1938, and Stalin in 1948, graciously consented to protect Czechoslovakia. So it was reported.

It is for these purposes, not for love of freedom, that Communists stir up agitation for civil rights. The whole movement, from the beginning, has been Communist-inspired and Communist-powered, although it has managed to enlist many good people and a good many politicians with vote-seeking instincts into giving it aid.

FEPC is a blow at Christianity. A responsibility has been placed on mankind to keep his race pure. We all agree that there is a Being more omnipotent than any other, Who made His people as He would have them be; and FEPC is a total disregard of human nature. There is no reason why any one group, by congressional action, should enforce their views on racial relations over the entire Nation. A true Christian holds that being a Christian makes a man better and more trustworthy. A Christian employer has a right to include a man's religious belief in any total estimate of his character. It may have something to do with his character. He has an unalienable right, which no law can take away, to entrust matters of confidence to a person of the Christian religion.

A man may be employed in a Christian organization and know a certain group of men there. He would rather trust them than to trust someone he did not know. Under the bill, he would probably have to employ the man he did not know. If he is a Jew, he has an unalienable right to trust a Jew. I notice that in a great many instances the Jews do trust each other, and I do not blame them one iota for it.

This proposed legislation attempts to do what is psychologically and mortally impossible. When the Government assumes to look into the mind of an employer and declare what went on in his mind as he looked over an applicant it assumes the omniscience of the Deity. What goes on in a person's mind is known only to God and himself, and this proposed legislation takes any man out of the rule of law and puts him at the mercy of any bureau or court.

One of the basic human rights God has given man is the right to make his own estimates of others, to like them or

dislike them, to trust them or to distrust them, to associate with them or to avoid them, for any reason or for no reason. The moment that right is taken away, freedom becomes a mockery. The civil rights agitation is designed to destroy that element of freedom.

This type of legislation destroys the free market for goods and services upon which our economic system and our political liberty both depend. In a free market for services, both employer and employee are free to bargain, and need not agree unless mutually satisfied. This system is our American way of doing business. FEPC would change all of this. It would bring the Government in as a third party—a party who can say, "You must employ this man, or you must employ this woman." This would result in the destruction of a free market. Again, this would suit the Communists.

This problem is a local one. The Federal Government should keep out of it, and should not meddle in the affairs of the States. I wonder how California would feel about it? That State voted almost three to one against FEPC legislation. Jefferson believed in an association of States rather than a strong central government. Why is it necessary to secure a concentration of all governmental powers in Washington? The social reformers want it here so their pet schemes can be put into effect and their own positions made more secure. We have had so many groups grabbing for power here in Washington that democracy itself is being impaired. Where is democracy? It is not here in Washington; it is back in the crossroads, in the towns, the counties, and the States. It is in the communities, towns, and cities where people live and die, where children are born, where public meetings are held, where people attend church. Kill this exercise of democracy by this and other so-called civil-rights measures and we will see democracy die. It will be replaced by a concentration of power in Washington and by an eventual dictatorship. To attempt force is to threaten national unity and to invite disruption. To attempt it now, with communism overhanging the world, is to play straight into the hands of Moscow.

I have been telling Members of the Senate what the bill would do. I want to read from the bill where I left off on last Friday:

(g) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

It does not say where they are going to place anyone. They would certainly place their friends at the top, if they are given such carte blanche authority as is indicated in the first sentence which I have just read.

I read further from the bill:

(2) to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies.

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the

Commission or any of its agents the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States.

The Commission can have a deposition taken and can pay the witness for signing his name and swearing to it. It was brought out on Friday, with reference to the first part of the bill, that the Commission is given the right to hold hearings. The bill does not provide where the hearings shall be held. It does not provide that a man in South Carolina shall be heard in South Carolina, or that the Commission shall hear a witness in North Carolina, or even in Virginia. The commission is established in Washington. The Commission will pay the witnesses. Imagine the fair trial that would result. The man who is hearing the evidence may be the one who brought the case before the Commission. The prosecution, the jury, and the court are all one.

Reading further from the bill:

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder.

They will be furnished with technical assistance. Technical knowledge. Free legal advice. All other expenses.

I read further:

(5) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate—

Cooperate with whom? Cooperate, as someone has said, with someone who had discriminated against someone else. Imagine being an employer who wished not to take sides. He had better take sides, and he had better take the right side. If he did not, this is what would happen. Listen to this, Senators:

(5) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action.

They violate the law unless they step in and cooperate with the side they ought to be on.

I read further:

(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

(7) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this act, and the Commission may authorize them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens residents of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2), for persons serving

without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

I hope Senators will notice that all the way through the bill there is no limitation on what they can do. There is no field into which they cannot go. They would be turned loose upon the people of the United States.

I read further:

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise.

They will have a Federal police set-up. I read further:

Provided, That the Commission is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession, or local government, to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases even though such cases may involve charges of unlawful employment practices within the scope of this act—

Can anyone imagine their turning jurisdiction over to anyone they thought would not push a case?

The bill reads further—

unless the provision of the statute or ordinance applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.

(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved—

Note that, Senators. Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed, it is heard on behalf of any person claiming to have been aggrieved.

The paragraph continues—

or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the Act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate—

Shall investigate. It does not say "may." They will stand behind the "shall" if Congress puts it in there.

It continues—

such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

Note the word "persuasion." I do not know what type of persuasion they would use.

I read further:

Nothing said or done during and as a part of such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding.

I have had some experience in court. It cannot be used against him, but when he is on the stand he can be asked the question, and a foundation can be laid for charging him with perjury if he does not tell the truth the second time.

I read:

Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within 1 year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful employment practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this act, or in advance thereof if circumstances so warrant, it shall cause a copy of such written charge to be served upon such person who has allegedly committed any unlawful employment practice, hereinafter called the respondent, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than 10 days after the service of such charge.

At a place herein fixed. Where is that place?

The bill provides further:

(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such written charge and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

I wonder where he would have to travel in order to attend that hearing.

There is nothing here to indicate. It will be found that under all our statutes when a man is accused he is allowed to be tried in his home community, in his home county. There is nothing about that written here. There is not anything in the bill which will require such a trial, even in the home State of the accused.

(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

(g) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof, except as a witness.

If someone has made an investigation, and is over the others in authority, he can come forward and testify. There is an attempt to make it appear that the Commission is not the jury and the judge and everything else, but all these people belong to the same Commission, all are working together—probably they sleep together at night.

(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision.

I know the Commission is going to have its headquarters in Washington, and the record probably will be sent to Washington.

The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice.

Reasonable time is given the accused to get to the hearing. I wonder who will pass upon what is a reasonable time.

In its discretion the committee on notice may take further testimony.

If they find the testimony is a little weak after the testimony is all taken, they can take further testimony.

(j) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find

that any person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice, and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees—

If a year has elapsed, and one employee has been out, the employer will have to pay him for a year and get another—

with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the act: *Provided, however*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the written charge has engaged in or is engaging in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From page 13.

Mr. LONG. The Senator just read the section where it is stated that the Commission may take additional testimony if it so desires.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LONG. There is no requirement that the Commission shall take additional testimony, is there?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is no word in the bill which gives the accused the right, on his own motion, to have anything opened up, and to go further. It is left entirely with the Commission.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, then, as I understand the Senator's argument, under the bill, if the Commission sees the record and decides that there is not enough in it to land a poor employer in jail, or to make him hire someone he does not desire, it can open the case up and take additional testimony if it so desired?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My interpretation is that the Commission can do that, and that they can prolong the case and have it hanging over the employer's head, not 1 day, not 1 month, not 1 year, but for 10 years, if they desire to do so.

Mr. LONG. Does not the bill further provide that an employer against whom a complaint is filed cannot, when such a case goes to court, urge any argument he has not made in the hearings or before the Commission?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is my interpretation of the bill, from a legal standpoint.

Mr. LONG. The Commission has the power to open the record, take additional testimony, and build the record up as far as it desires, until it is ready to make its findings; and once its findings are made, the man against whom the complaint is filed will have no right to make any argu-

ment he might desire to add to the record, would he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, and the Commission can prolong the case as long as they desire, and cost the Government as much as they desire. They can string it out as long as they want to. Remember that the Federal Government is paying the costs of all the witnesses, for all testimony, and everything, so far as their side is concerned, but not for the other side.

Mr. LONG. I think the distinguished Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I read further from the bill:

(k) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

If they see that they made a mistake, they can go back and modify the finding. If they think they are going to be reversed, they can modify it.

(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Here is the joke; because a finding once made is equivalent to law. I have had a great deal of experience in the field of law so far as hearings before boards and commissions are concerned, and my colleagues know, as well as I do, speaking from a legal standpoint, that if there is any evidence to sustain the finding of the Commission, as in the case of a finding by a jury, the finding of the Commission cannot be set aside. But listen to this:

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States Court of Appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court or other United States court of the territory or place within the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

It will be noticed that a transcript of the entire record is required. In some cases of appeal the transcript of the entire record would cost an exorbitant sum of money. I have had some experiences in that field. When I had a case in which I knew it would not be necessary for me to appeal, but in which the other side would be obliged to appeal, I would put plenty of testimony in the record,

because I knew the other side would have to pay for it if it appealed, and that the cost would be considerable. When the cost of appeal is great that in itself tends to discourage an appeal being taken. The Commission would have knowledge of that fact. They would place so much testimony in the record that it would be burdensome for the other side to appeal. The other side would be inclined to forfeit its rights rather than pay the considerable sum involved as cost of appeal.

(b) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

I know of no court that does not have a right to do that. The bill, however, provides such power, in event the case ever gets to court. But as I see the situation, only a few cases would wind up in court. Those of us who have been engaged as lawyers in court know what would happen. We might as well use our imaginations with respect to what would take place under the provisions of the bill.

(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

(d) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

In practically all cases tried before the Commission the Court will have that right.

(e) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed—

That is, after they get into court—and it shall file such modified or new findings and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

It will be noticed that the Commission is given the power to do that after the case is brought into court. It had always been my thought that courts existed to give both sides an equal opportunity. But under this provision the Commission can modify its findings after the case has been brought to court. A right is thus given to the Commission which is not given to the other side.

(f) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and

by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(g) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person transacts business, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside.

I move over to page 20.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

SEC. 10. (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, in any amount exceeding \$10,000. Such regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

NOTICES TO BE POSTED

SEC. 11. (a) Every employer and labor organization shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of the act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the act.

(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 for each separate offense.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

I thought something would have to be done for the veterans.

SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, Territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

Thank the Lord, the veterans are cared for.

I read further from the bill:

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 14. Whoever shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a

member, agent, or employee of the Commission while engaged in the performance of duties under this act, or because of such performance, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both.

If this bill is enacted into law, and if the agents or employees of the Commission begin to investigate, every employer in the country had better be good to them and do what they want done; every employer had better not interfere with them or resist them or oppose them or impede them or intimidate them.

Let me ask this question: What would a Senator do if he were an employer and if agents or employees or representatives of the Commission came into his establishment and accused him of violating the law by discriminating against someone? Would a Senator in such a case oppose them, if he thought he had not been guilty of discriminating against anyone?

I ask Senators to think about that. Would they oppose such agents or employees under such circumstances? If a Senator should "resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission," he could be fined \$500 or could be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

Madam President, this proposal, if enacted into law and if really enforced and put into effect, would be calamitous.

Of course, I do not want any law to be put on the statute books unless it is going to be enforced. We should not have on the statute books laws which are not enforced. We should not pass a law if we do not propose to have it enforced and if we are not in sympathy with it.

However, if this proposal is enacted into law and put into effect, I predict—and I ask all Senators to note my prediction—that in less than 10 years from that time we will have a depression worse than the so-called Hoover depression, the depression which followed the Hoover administration.

We cannot regulate employment, in every line of business in respect to every promotion and every demotion, and otherwise tell the employer what to do, unless we propose to wreck our way of doing business in the United States. When that is done, this country will be set back, not 1 day, but 50 years.

Madam President, I am pleading with my fellow Senators to consider the importance of this matter, and I am pleading with all my colleagues not to vote for the enactment of such legislation.

First of all, the Senate should not take up this legislative proposal; we should not take the first step toward its enactment. We are now discussing the question of whether the Senate should proceed to consider the bill. I am grateful for the Senate rule which requires that in order to invoke cloture on debate, 64 Senators must be present and vote in favor of cloture, in favor of limiting debate—in other words, that 64 Senators must so vote before this proposal can be taken up.

Madam President, I do not want any Senator to become ill; but it might be good for the United States if some Sena-

tors happened to be absent because of illness on the day when the question now before the Senate is voted on, for if a Senator who proposed to vote in favor of having the Senate take up this bill were absent at the time when that vote was taken, he certainly could not be recorded as voting in favor of having the Senate consider the measure. Of course, I do not want any Senator to be sick; I never would want that to happen. However, I hope that when the vote is taken there will not be a sufficient number of Senators voting in favor of having the Senate consider the bill.

Madam President, I hold in my hand a small pamphlet issued by Dr. James W. Fifield, a Congregational minister, of Los Angeles, California. I was almost thrilled when I read it, for it sets forth my views on this matter—so much so, that I decided that I would read it into the RECORD today. The title is "Faith and Freedom," and this pamphlet is described as the Monthly Journal of Spiritual Mobilization. The issue I hold in my hand is volume 1, No. 6, for May 1950. It reads as follows:

FEDERALIZED RACE PREJUDICE—WILL THE FEPC BE ABLE TO SOLVE THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM?

Judeo-Christian conscience has always been strong for statute sin; people must be made good by law.

The fact that every attempt in this direction has failed in the purpose, that the law has always induced lawbreaking rather than virtue—as witness our prohibition experiment—cannot down the heritage. Presently, the advocates of legislated goodness are pressing hard for a thunderbolt against race prejudice. President Truman, in particular, wants a Federal Employment Practices Commission to put sense into men's minds, decency into their hearts.

It is to the credit of the composite American intelligence that this proposal is meeting a very chill reception. If the Commission is actually established it will certainly lack the powers at first adumbrated. But an analysis of what Mr. Truman wants, in this connection, is not less timely because he is unlikely to get it.

Free choice?

The proposed law, intended to give redress to those who lose jobs simply because of their minority position, begins by limiting the employer in the choice of his associates; he must not hire only those whom he is pleased to hire.

Why? It is not yet a tenet of American politics that a man cannot be selective in the choice of his social contacts. He may still choose his tennis, bridge, or marriage partner. What principle is invoked in legally limiting his business associates?

The principle is implicit: That society has a stake in capital. The owner cannot claim absolute ownership, because it is reasoned that capital is a social product, and the state may therefore intervene in its management. The alleged right of the state, in designating the associates of the capital-owner, rests on the socialistic notion of the collective character of capital. The FEPC proposal, then, is merely another denial of the right of private property, and another evidence of how far Marxist notions have permeated our thinking.

COMPETENCE BECAUSE OF FREEDOM

Putting theory aside, as a practical matter the free exercise of judgment in the selection of its operatives is essential to the best use of capital, and therefore in the best interest of society as a whole. When a capital-owner employs a helper he is entrusting

capital to the care of the latter. The lowliest member of the crew has power to do harm to these instruments of production. Incompetence or dishonesty may cause losses.

Does society benefit from inefficiency? Does it make allowances for incompetence? On the contrary, it coldly rejects the marginal producer by refusing him its custom. Since society is thus arbitrary in its market selectivity, it has no right to interfere in the management of production. Enterprise can serve only when it is free.

Congeniality is as important in a business organization as is competence. A complement of workers of similar background or habits will be more productive than one characterized by divergencies. A publisher of Catholic books would find a staff of Protestants or atheists difficult for his purpose. A kosher slaughterhouse would be in trouble if its crew were unacquainted with or unsympathetic to the ritual. The trustees of a Quaker college would like it to have more than a proportionate number of Quaker students. Selectivity in many cases is a matter of necessity.

These problems of management are bypassed in the urgency to eradicate discrimination on the ground of race or religion. That is the sin. It is wrong against society, if not against God, to deny employment to Jews as Jews, to Catholics as Catholics. Why?

WILL FEPC CREATE MORE JOBS?

Prejudice is an irrationality, perhaps a form of insanity. But, if all irrationalities were banished by law, who would insure that the custodians were rational? He who hates his fellow man harbors a canker in his heart, but if that cankerous condition pleases him that is his affair. Society has no power to make him over, no mandate to try it.

The charge is made, however, that in venturing his spleen against a given group the employer deprives its members of the right to earn a living. That is silly. If he employs a Jew instead of a Baptist, the latter is hurt; if the selection is reversed, the Jew is hurt. Where one job is at stake, one or the other of two applicants must fail to obtain it. The right to earn a living is impaired by the lack of jobs, not by prejudice, and the FEPC is not concerned with making more jobs. It is merely a venture in compulsory ethics.

This bill, if enacted, will create prejudice where this is none, intensify prejudice where it already exists. Since it would be possible, under this plan, for a discharged employee to haul an employer before the FEPC on the charge of discrimination, the employer who does not now concern himself with such matters would in self-protection be forced to consider the race or religion of the applicant.

Should the commission "qualify" the discharged employee, the employer would not only have to associate with the unwanted person but would also have to suffer a back-pay fine. All the more reason for the personnel office to be careful.

SINGLED-OUT PREJUDICE

In order to avoid the wrath of the FEPC, every firm would have to establish a token quota of those generally considered discriminatees, and these would always carry the stigma of a necessary evil. They would be so singled out by fellow workers, with consequent unpleasantness.

Prejudice would also be accentuated by the provision in the proposal regarding advancement. Rivals on the staff would not hesitate to point out that the one receiving preference is of the unwanted group, and that he was pushed ahead of them merely as a sop to the law, not because he had earned advancement.

CONTRABAND INFORMATION

As with every law that presumes to interfere with individual habits or preferences, this one would give rise to methods

of evasion; the necessity for evasion would intensify the hatred of those whom the plan proposes to help. Employment agencies would become detective services, providing the contraband information. Since one who resigns cannot claim discrimination, there would be resort to nasty ways of forcing resignations. Employers who did not make inquiries as to race and religion when hiring, would certainly have to know about these particulars when firing.

Some of the possible, nay probable, political consequences of the proposed law ought to be considered.

WHICH PREFERENCE WILL HAVE PRIORITY?

An existing law condones, even demands, discrimination. Under practices following from the Wagner Labor Relations Act, an employer is compelled to give preference to a labor union member.

Suppose an employer discriminates in favor of a Jew who is a member of the union, against a Catholic who cannot gain admission. Suppose the latter brings the case before the FEPC, claiming religious discrimination. Will the agency have power to compel the union to extend membership to the Catholic? How would you handle a complaint from white men (or women) who might seek jobs as pullman porters, now monopolized by Negroes?

DOES FEPC PROVIDE AN ANSWER?

The scarcity of jobs in the 1930's was the underlying cause of race riots in Detroit; white workers resented the influx of Negroes. Here the discrimination was practiced by workers, not by employers. How would the FEPC handle this always latent problem? Or, again, if a southern employer were compelled by local prejudice to discharge a Negro employee, how would the FEPC propose to enforce its edict?

UNEMPLOYMENT THE REAL PROBLEM

Such stinging bees are nestled in a plan that attempts to deal with the social and moral consequences of an economic problem it cannot solve. If the problem of unemployment could be solved, the problem of prejudice would be academic. Philosophers, not politicians, might concern themselves with it. The deepest prejudices of the most narrow-minded employer will give way to his need for help when help is scarce.

But during a depression, the problem of selection would be made difficult by the antidiscrimination law, and employers might for fear of reprisals, turn to the FEPC for assistance.

They could ask the agency to qualify employees in advance. It is not outside the range of possibility that power would thus be thrust on the bureaucrats. The FEPC could find itself in the position of a national employment agency.

Nor should we overlook the campaign potential of this bureau. The administration would most certainly advertise its antidiscrimination record to win minority group votes, while the opposition would appeal to the unemployed who could with some reason blame their plight on discrimination. Our political campaigns would thus be further impregnated with the stench and bitterness of racial and religious antagonisms.

NO LIMITS

Furthermore, while the proposed law does not consider discrimination on the grounds of sex, age, or fraternal connections, what would prevent pressure groups from demanding that the scope of the FEPC be extended? If an institution employs Masons only, could not the Elks make an issue of it? The "over 40" workers and the unemployed female linotype operators might well see their redress in an amendment and expansion of FEPC.

And, since power is the lifeblood of bureaucracy, the FEPC would most assuredly look with favor on the efforts of pressure groups to broaden its sphere of interest.

Thus, inherent in this piece of legislation is a mess of trouble. This is the case simply because it would again attempt the impossible task of making men good by legislative fiat. The only thing to be done with the irrationality of prejudice is to ignore it. Efforts at legal suppression can only inflame this prejudice and give us more Government intervention to boot.

Mr. President, I am glad to read from this booklet. I agree with the statement almost in toto, for it points out to us that we are in danger of passing legislation which would injure us not only from a moral standpoint, but commercially and economically throughout the Nation.

It is well understood among lawyers and laymen that in the field of legislation which attempts to regulate private conduct the powers of Congress are much more limited than are those of the State legislatures.

The bill deals with alleged discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Some of the words appear superfluous, since every race has a distinctive color. Actually, the bill deals with races, religions, and nationalities. It specifically deals with aliens and American citizens, even American citizens under this legislative proposal may not be preferred to aliens. It makes no difference how good an American a man may be, he cannot receive any preference over a Communist in America. That is true in the business world, according to the bill.

How can Congress absolve or exculpate itself from blame for proposing such an unfair procedure? How can the Congress solve the problem and get itself out of the situation in which it finds itself? I am sure this bill will not work out well in regard to alleged discriminations in America.

Heretofore the discussion of races and religions has been fraught with difficulty and the intrepid soul who analyzes those phases of our life is immediately set upon as being intolerant or bigoted. Now that the matter is before the Senate, plain, full, free, and accurate discussion and analysis of these phases of our life are required. There must be no hesitancy and no taboos.

Mr. President, that is why it is necessary for me to speak on this subject at length. A measure such as the FEPC bill, with its elaborate findings and declarations of policy, necessarily requires an extended speech in order to determine whether there is any real basis for the findings and declarations of policy as written into the first part of the bill. We find the facts and declarations of policy are not conclusive as to the need or propriety of constitutional validity of a law. Any statement which is of a debatable character and accuracy may be challenged.

The statement that discrimination forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living is highly debatable, since it is difficult to understand how the forced employment of one person in place of another can improve the standard of living of the displaced person. Likewise the statement that discrimination deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production is essentially an attack upon the theory of a

free, competitive economy. So long as competition is the rule of industry, necessarily the most successful enterprises must be those that utilize the services of the most capable persons who can be organized to work cooperatively to advance common interests. To insist that the Government shall undertake to determine how and what employees shall be selected, and thus to restrict competition and the competitive judgment of the managers of private enterprise, is to undermine the very foundations of private enterprise and a competitive system. This is simply an oratorical justification of legislation based on assumptions which cannot be regarded as findings of fact.

If a person were going to employ a man to manage a big business, would he not choose a man who is capable of choosing other persons to work under him, to carry on the business, or would he rather trust to some commission in Washington to tell him whom to hire, whom to fire, whom to promote, or whom to demote? Which would be for the best interests of the particular business? Suppose there were discrimination against a person because he were a Jew, or a Catholic, or a Protestant, or even because he was a white person. Should not an employer be able to select those he thinks best fitted to work for him without restriction? Do not Senators think that is best for business in the United States? If we pass this bill, we are saying to businessmen throughout the United States, "You had better not hire the one you think is best for your business, because the Commission may consider you to be discriminating against someone else who may belong to a minority group." It would keep business in fear all the time. I know what I should want to do if I had a big business and were confronted with such a situation. I would feel like turning my business over to them and saying, "You had better do the hiring and firing for me. You tell me whether it is right for me to promote this one or that one. If I do not promote the right person, I will be hauled before the Commission and tried. I will be fined. I will have to pay the fellow whom I did not employ, and to the fellow whom I did not promote I will have to pay the difference in wages between what he receives and what the fellow whom I promoted receives."

That is exactly what this bill would do. It is not a question of the colored man about whom we hear so much. As I see it, it is Washington trying to get more power. When some Senators rise and say, "We are against bureaucrats," I say that this is the time to show their colors and vote against forming another bureaucracy in Washington which would have its hands on every business of any size in America.

So long as competition is the rule of industry, necessarily, the most successful enterprises must be those that utilize the services of the most capable persons organized to work cooperatively to advance common interests.

I have repeated that statement because it is so true.

To insist that the Government shall undertake to determine how and what employees shall be selected, and thus to

restrict competition and the competitive judgment of the managers of private enterprise, is to undermine the very foundations of private enterprise and a competitive system.

The declaration that the right to employment without discrimination is a right of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States is a declaration quite beyond the power of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States has held time and time again that any power to create a civil right, unless specifically delegated to the United States by the Constitution, has been reserved to the separate States.

It is argued, of course, that the power of the Federal Government over interstate and foreign commerce provides a constitutional basis for the proposed law. However, in the first place, the bill only purports to apply to persons engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ 50 or more individuals, whereas the findings and declaration of policy undertakes to create a civil right for all the people of the United States.

The proposed law goes to the other extreme and is an attempt to reconstruct society by subjecting all private enterprise to regulation by the state for the purpose of substituting the moral judgment of a political majority for the independent judgment of an employer as to those persons with whom he wishes to associate himself in the activities of a private business enterprise. This would mean complete domination of private business by the state, and, as has been pointed out, the gradual but sure destruction of private enterprise.

This country grew great because under the Constitution as it was written, and interpreted as it was written, there were no minorities as such. The recent tendency to create minorities in order to stir up class consciousness and to induce segmental attitudes among the people should be abhorred. This has been the curse of Europe, and it is plain that the designing few are bent on creating here a veritable Balkans, with all the plagues which have afflicted Europe for centuries. This bill will be a step in Balkanization of the United States by stirring up race and class consciousness which otherwise would lie dormant and dissipate itself in the progress of futurity. The bill engenders group isolation with a tendency to infuse and instill group consciousness of a combative nature with a consequent disharmony in our national life. Its group or clan isolationist effects really constitute its actual purpose. Some of its backers are more interested in trying to weaken the United States than in aiding their fictitiously concocted minorities.

What is a minority? How can it truly be said that we have minorities in this country? It is neither fair nor accurate to pick up one class or group and weigh it against all the rest of the people composed of different, disparate, and diverse elements themselves minorities, if you please, and say that such a group is a minority. Rather should it be asked, Is there any one homogeneous group

which can dominate all the rest of the people? The answer is at once, "No." This bill actually deals with manufactured and self-styled minorities. It sets them up in the law. It is said there are approximately 20,000,000 Catholics in the country, but they are composed of Italians, French, Germans, Polish, and many other national groups. Certainly they are not going to oppress one another or discriminate against themselves. Moreover, they are the largest single religious group because the Protestants again are subdivided into numerous religious denominations.

The Jews, considered either as a race or creed, themselves coming from different countries, most assuredly are not discriminating against one another in their own ranks for that reason. Furthermore, as a class, they are so large in numbers—including refugees and resident aliens amounting probably to six or seven millions and economically occupy so powerful a position in the Government, courts, and entire industrial life that they cannot possibly be said to be a minority.

The colored are, for practical purposes, all composed of citizens of the United States and actually native-born, thus enjoying this great advantage. They represent as large a homogeneous group, if the word can be so used in this manner, as exists here. Their status, political and economic, has improved marvelously since the War Between the States. If in the next 50 to 75 years they make the same educational, economic, and social progress, their accomplishments will be one of the most outstanding achievements of modern times. As they continue to grow in mind and spirit, improve in their health conditions, and rise to a sense of increased responsibility, they will, like any and all other citizens who have accomplished these things, feel a sense of satisfaction and enjoyment in that which they have done. Persistent agitation, designed to cause all colored people to have such a group consciousness as to carry continuously a chip on their shoulders, making themselves color-conscious, simply creates, maintains, and stimulates an inferiority complex which prevents, hinders, and impedes their own progress. Moreover, it might accomplish the most dangerous thing of all, namely, to make the white people color-conscious, and thus stir up and actually institute a feeling not even existing among vast numbers of white persons today.

It is seen, therefore, that the United States, which is sometimes called a country and not a Nation because of the large groups of different nationalities and descents, has no one dominant element in it sufficient to force its will—even if so inclined—on the whole people, and this is true from a religious, racial, and nationality standpoint. Just as soon as any one religion or race attempted to be dominant, all the others would gang up and forestall any such action. This is just human nature. So the minority idea is false in fact and theory, and its attempted propagation is inimical to the national interest, and subversive of

unity. It is the most insidious form of internal-conflict provocation.

The FEPC bill is wholly one-sided. The entitlement of the bill is to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, but when the body of the measure is examined, it is seen that only one phase of discrimination is treated, namely, discrimination against; discrimination in favor of is entirely ignored.

This bill is, therefore, antidemocratic. It is just as evil to give a person a job because of his race, his color, his religion, or national origin, as it is to deny him a job on account of it. The presence in industry, government, or any place where persons are hired, of large number of persons of the same race, color, religion, or national origin, should be considered evidence of discrimination in favor of, just as absence of any particular group might be thought to create a presumption of discrimination against. If this kind of legislation is to become national policy, it ought to be fair and equal. It ought to work both ways. It ought not to be one-sided. It ought not to be discriminatory. It should not foster unfair practice. It should be to prohibit discrimination in favor of as well as against.

One of the particularly obnoxious features of many foreign countries is the police state. In such a state the individual is constantly under surveillance in almost all of the ramifications of his existence. He is beset on every hand with innumerable snoopers of one kind or another. For the sake of economy and efficiency in such foreign states, their surveillance is to a large degree centralized. Without realizing it, this country is fast coming to what might be called a composite police state. The same thing is fast being accomplished through the medium of a number of Federal agencies, everyone possessing sizable police and investigative powers. So far, these investigative, police, visitational, and inquisitorial powers have been largely confined to property and property rights. Now they are to be extended, under FEPC, to persons and their habits, customs, and morals. The subpoena powers and investigative authority conferred on the Commission in the present legislative proposal should not become the pattern which Congress is to follow in successive acts, because the aggregate will surely bring on the police state, which has been the bane of civilized existence in many states abroad.

The net result of all this, is that, brushing aside the window dressing of the bill, it must stand or fall on the commerce clause. The framers of the proposed legislation may not derive any constitutional strength for it from the negative provisions of the fifth amendment, although they may run afoul of it.

Mr. President, if the bill should become law, it would, in my humble opinion, cause a great deal of misunderstanding, it would cause many businesses to close, it would throw a great many persons out of employment. That condition would come about because business

in America cannot successfully be operated if it is all the time under surveillance and told what it shall do. So I urge upon the Senate that the bill not be passed, and that the motion to consider it be rejected.

Mr. President, the bill would place more obnoxious controls and restrictions, social and economic, upon the lives of the people than any legislation of which I have knowledge, heretofore attempted to be passed. If enacted, the law would apply not to the South alone. It would affect all sections of our great country. The manufacturing plants of the North, East, and West would alike be affected. Passage of the bill would sound the death knell of all free enterprise in America.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees; and

S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.

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

H. R. 1151. An act to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers;

H. R. 2783. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.; and

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau (Alaska) Camp.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1354. An act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California;

H. R. 2387. An act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections; and

H. R. 5097. An act for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the

House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7302) to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSE OF INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN INDUSTRIES

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably and without amendment, Senate Resolution 274, which I submitted in behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and myself on the 12th day of May.

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

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which was unanimously approved by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the cause or causes of increasing unemployment in the coal, oil, silver, zinc, lead, and railroad industries. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem proper, to the Senate on or before the 25th day of June 1950.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand from the Senator from West Virginia that the resolution was favorably reported from the committee, with substantially a full membership present.

Mr. NEELY. A quorum was present. The committee's approval was unanimous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did all the minority members of the committee who were present approve the resolution?

Mr. NEELY. They did. The minority members present were the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question: Does the resolution require any funds from the Senate?

Mr. NEELY. It requires no expenditure whatever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the committee now has the power to make such an investigation, and I

further understand that it is the purpose of the Senator from West Virginia to obtain the endorsement of the Senate for an investigation which the committee really can make anyway.

Mr. NEELY. The committee could make the investigation without Senate action, but, in my opinion, Senate approval would promote the success of the undertaking.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall not object.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire a little about the resolution. Which committee of the Senate would the resolution authorize to make the inquiry?

Mr. NEELY. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MYERS. Under the resolution, that committee is to make the investigation; is that correct?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection.

I believe this matter should be studied, considered, and thoroughly investigated. I know that in the Senator's State of West Virginia and in my own State there has been considerable controversy over this very problem. I think it is something which should be given thorough consideration, because I understand that many of the mines which have been closed, have been forced to cease operating, because of the importation of foreign oil.

Mr. NEELY. That is true. Not only mines but also domestic refineries are being closed by the cut-throat competition of foreign oil.

Mr. MYERS. So I really believe the resolution should receive the immediate consideration of the Senate, and I heartily endorse the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say that I further understand that the resolution applies not only to coal, but also to zinc and lead.

Mr. NEELY. It includes unemployment in the coal, oil, zinc, lead, silver, and railroad industries.

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

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think I am correct in stating, am I not, that this afternoon, at a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, at which seven members of the committee were present, the resolution was reported favorably by unanimous vote?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether any appropriation is involved or authorized by the resolution?

Mr. NEELY. None whatever.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 274) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the

cause or causes of increasing unemployment in the coal, oil, silver, zinc, lead, and railroad industries. The committee shall report its finding, together with such recommendations as it may deem proper, to the Senate on or before the twenty-fifth day of June 1950.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement regarding the resolution.

I wish to commend the Senator from West Virginia for the resolution, which he has just submitted, carrying out further the very striking and, I think, statesmanlike speech which the Senator from West Virginia made in the Senate a few days regarding the peril to our economy as a result of foreign importations. I know that in the hands of the Senator from West Virginia, who I assume will be named as chairman of the subcommittee to deal with this matter, we shall have before the date fixed in the resolution—namely, June 25, 1950, or some time within the next 5 or 6 weeks—a report on this matter which in my judgment may well be a waymark in pointing out the peril of the course we have been pursuing.

I think especial commendation is called for because of the fact that the resolution comes from the other side of the Chamber, with the unanimous consent of all the Senators who were present following the quorum call—indicating that they were not prepared to follow without questioning the doctrines which have been enunciated throughout the country in the past week by the distinguished President of the United States on his nonpolitical tour, demanding not only that we should endorse all the previous reductions of our tariffs, but that we should go further not only with the reductions in tariffs now contemplated at Torquay, England, at the conference now planned, but also that we should adopt the International Trade Organization, which would freeze for years to come the present condition of our country. As the Senator from West Virginia has well pointed out, we are already suffering disastrous results and there are possibilities of further damage which it is impossible to calculate.

So I consider that the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia is not only to be commended, but that the report which may be filed on the basis of the resolution and the limited materials available, may well point out the way by which to save the country from the course which the President is trying, in his advocacy of it, to persuade the Nation to adopt in the interest, so he alleges, of peace.

After all, Mr. President, we reduced tariffs in 1913, and 5 years later we had a world war. We reduced tariffs again in 1932, and 8 years later we had a world war. Certainly the path of tariff reductions is not the path which has kept the United States out of war.

I do not blame the Democrats, but I certainly think the Republicans could not have done any worse.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on this occasion, I shall refrain from discussing either the age-old tariff question, or the doctrines of the beloved President of the

United States. But I assure the distinguished Senator from Maine that the investigation which will be made in accordance with the resolution will shed light on the devastation caused by flooding foreign oil, which is daily and hourly injuring our coal, oil, and railroad industries.

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

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am heartily in favor of the resolution, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia well knows. I have already complimented him upon the forceful address he delivered in the Senate last week, relative to the purposes of the resolution and its basis.

No doubt the resolution is sufficiently broad to cover more than the oil and coal industries and unemployment in those particular industries, for I understood that it would also include an investigation into such commodities as glassware and lead and zinc.

Mr. NEELY. It includes only the lead, zinc, silver, coal, oil, and railroad industries.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for broadening the scope of the resolution so as to have it include at least those commodities and industries.

I am quite sure that if the distinguished Senator will carry this matter to a successful conclusion—as I know he will—he will be able to make many other observations about the importation of commodities other than oil.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator should not doubt either the thoroughness or fairness of the investigation or report since the eminent Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the eminent Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will be members of the subcommittee by which the investigation and report will be made. Notwithstanding my chairmanship of the subcommittee, its work will be well done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the information. I am happy indeed to see a committee of this kind undertake the investigation, which I think is badly needed. The Senate should have light upon the impact of the flood of such importations not only upon the domestic economy but upon the dislocations of industry, and certainly the unemployment situation which is bound to result if the movement continues on the present scale.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say and I think the Senator will agree—that the limitation in the resolution does not indicate any conclusions as to whether the difficulties may be more widespread. We on this side of the Chamber were very happy to cooperate with the somewhat limited scope of the resolution, not only because that was what the Senator from West Virginia was addressing himself to, in view of his concern for his own constituents, which is most commendable, but because, as time goes on, it may appear that a broader scope will be desirable, either through his committee or other committees.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me repeat the assurance which I gave some of my friends on the Republican side during my recent discussion of this question. If it should appear that any other industry is suffering as the coal, oil and railroad industries are suffering, I shall help to provide proper relief.

THE CROSSROADS IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there has been much discussion recently on the question of how to get the Reds out of the Federal Government. Today I want to discuss an equally important question—how to get the Federal Government out of the “red.”

In 1951 the United States Government is planning to spend approximately \$42,000,000,000. Placed end to end, these billions of dollars, in 1 dollar bills, would circle the globe 162 times. This is a tremendous amount of money. When we talk about billions of dollars, it is beyond the comprehension of the average person. Let us consider 42,000,000,000 in terms of 1 dollar bills. In 1 dollar bills, the amount of money proposed to be spent by the Government as I have said, would go around the world at its widest point 162 times. This amount is from \$6,000,000,000 to \$7,000,000,000 more than the estimated \$35,000,000,000 to \$36,000,000,000 the Government hopes to collect in taxes and other revenues during the same period.

In other words, for the twentieth year in a row, with the exception of 2 years, 1947 and 1948, during which the Republicans controlled the Congress of the United States, when the Republicans balanced the budget and reduced the debt substantially—except for those 2 years, for the past 20 years the annual Federal expenditures have exceeded the annual Federal income. The most amazing part of this dismal story is that recently this deficit has been incurred despite unprecedentedly high Federal receipts caused by our greatly increased national income.

This annual Federal deficit—and what we should do about it—is what I want to discuss. During the war it was necessarily tolerated because of the national emergency. Today that alibi no longer holds true. There is no more reason for spending beyond our income today than there was in the thirties—and it is many times as dangerous. If we spend so much beyond our income in a normal peacetime year, what will happen if we have an economic or foreign crisis? Each year we are led to understand that in this particular year, “because of the emergency,” we cannot have a balanced budget. The inference is that next year—always next year—things will look brighter, and then we shall begin to balance the budget and reduce the debt. The inference is that next year we are going to do something about it. It reminds me a good deal of the New Year’s resolution of Mark Twain. On one occasion he made the following New Year’s resolution: “This year I am going to live within my income—even if I have to borrow money to do it.” That is the principle on which the Federal Government

has been operating. President Roosevelt started it back in 1932 when he said:

Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

I do not think I need comment on that statement. We all know the record of Roosevelt's New Deal policies.

Two years ago I stood in this same spot and warned the Congress that we were approaching a crossroads in Government spending. I said that we must either put our financial house in order or suffer heavier and heavier onslaughts on the bulwark of our democratic way of life.

Today I repeat that warning. But this time let me add that each day that passes, each dollar we add to the Federal debt, each time we allow for an expansion of the welfare state, we are forcing ourselves into a harder decision. And if we go beyond the crossroads, there may come a time when the decision will no longer be ours to make. Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes recently stated much the same idea when he said to the Southern Governors:

We see many of the states of western Europe and Great Britain which have embraced socialism, unable to stand on their own feet; the very existence of their governments is dependent upon the taxpayers of the United States. It would seem prudent for us to hold fast to our system of government and to put our financial house in order. Instead of that, we are threatened with the concentration in Washington of the powers of local governments, including police powers and the imposition of creeping but ever-advancing socialistic programs.

Mr. President, we stand at the crossroads, and there are three paths we can take: First, we can take the road to the right. We can adopt the proposed spending program for 1951 and raise the taxes necessary to meet its requirements. Second, we have the road to the left. We can adopt the proposed spending program for 1951, leave taxes where they are and let the deficit be added to the already staggering \$255,600,000,000 debt.

Third, we can take the center course. We can reduce the expenditures proposed in the budget to equal expected revenues.

Let us examine each of these briefly. First, the road to the right; the proposition to increase taxes to meet our deficit.

Undoubtedly this could be done. It would, however, increase the Federal tax burden one and one-half billion dollars above the wartime peak. That wartime peak tax load, it will be remembered, was intended to eliminate as much spending as possible. We did not want the consumer to compete for goods in short supply and thus encourage the black market.

More important, if local and State taxes are included, the average tax burden today is even higher than it was in 1945 when we were fighting a war and trying to pay for it at the same time. If substantial new taxes were added to the present load, it would cut our purchasing power and thereby glut our markets.

There is also the matter of incentives. Incentives apply not only to corporations

and people with large incomes to invest, but also to Mr. Average Man trying to make financial provision for his future and the future of his children.

The President has indicated that he is counting heavily on an expanding economy to take care of the national debt. If the incentive to produce is destroyed by oppressive taxes, there will be no expansion.

Most of us, when we think of taxes, have in mind the March 15 payments or month-end payroll deductions. Yet only about 42 percent of the Federal tax revenue comes from personal-income taxes. Most of the remaining 58 percent of Federal revenue comes from excise and corporation taxes. These are very frequently hidden taxes—taxes hidden in prices. On cigarettes the Federal tax is 7½ cents a pack; on distilled spirits, about 50 percent; on theater admissions, 20 percent; on refrigerators, radios, electric, gas, and oil appliances from 5 to 25 percent; on baby oil, luggage, jewelry, and soap, 20 percent; on telephones, telegraph, and travel, 15 to 25 percent. For example, there are 151 different taxes on a loaf of bread.

The administration has implied that the present deficit is the result of the tax cut made by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Let us examine this idea. In the first place, the President himself had recommended a previous tax cut.

Furthermore, many noted economists have indicated that the reduction in wartime taxes made by the Eightieth Congress provided the additional stimulus needed to carry the Nation successfully over the postwar slump when supply caught up with purchasing power. As Prof. Sumner Slichter, noted Harvard economist, has pointed out:

The cut in the personal-income taxes, effective in the middle of 1948, helped increase incomes after taxes at the time when consumer buying was leveling off.

Thus, had it not been for that much-maligned tax cut, the mild economic adjustments we have been undergoing in the past 18 months might have been far more severe—might, in fact, have been as disastrous as administration leaders had prophesied would happen at the end of the war, but which never occurred.

Mr. President, we have on the north a neighbor, Canada. Canada has had an experience in tax reduction, and it is a very noteworthy illustration of what could happen here. Since the war, the Canadian Government has made 5 successive tax cuts in 5 years. Each of these reductions was substantial, the total being approximately 55 percent of the tax collections in the last war year. Yet, tax receipts have varied very little. Why? Because, when the taxes were reduced, the economy of Canada expanded.

A tax increase now would, in my opinion, dry up our purchasing power, halt our economic expansion, and ultimately throw millions of people on relief rolls in the most serious economic depression we have ever faced.

No; increased taxes to make up our present deficit cannot and must not be the answer.

A long step toward solution of our tax problem must some day be taken.

This step will involve reorganization of our entire tax system. It is ridiculous for a Nation which supports a free economy likewise to support a tax system calculated to destroy the free economy. We must provide incentives. We must eliminate double taxation. We must seek venture capital and return it to the money markets. These ends can be accomplished only through reorganization of our entire tax structure for the purpose of providing proper incentives.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In order to make the comparison complete, has the Senator any knowledge of the amount of the Canadian debt at the start and at the finish of the war, and how much it has been reduced percentage-wise, as compared with our own debt?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have the figures in my office, but I did not bring them to the Chamber today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not that a proper part of the Senator's discussion?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, it is. Later on I shall put the figures into the RECORD.

(In the daily RECORD of Wednesday, May 17, Mr. BRIDGES made the following statement, which, on his request and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be transposed and printed at this point in the permanent RECORD:)

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a table showing the Canadian national debt during the past 5 years. This information was requested of me on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on Monday last. I have been furnished the following figures by the officials at the Canadian Embassy:

Canadian debt

1945-46.....	\$16,807,000,000
1946-47.....	16,524,000,000
1947-48.....	15,957,000,000
1948-49.....	15,585,000,000
1949-50.....	15,191,000,000

Mr. BRIDGES. Alternative No. 2, the road to the left, is deficit financing—leaving taxes where they are, spending more than we collect, increasing the Federal debt.

This I regard as even more undesirable than increased taxation. Yet this is the program to which the administration has been committed since 1933. Dr. Edwin J. Nourse, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has even pointed out that deficits, he is afraid, are becoming a way of life.

Let us remember that except for the Republican years of a balanced budget, a man 40 years old has never seen his Government make ends meet since he was old enough to vote.

Nor, when an individual spends more than he makes, he may get for a year or two, but ultimately and inevitably the end is bankruptcy. The same is true of governments.

If deficit financing can be thought of as a disease, then inflation of currency is the telltale pockmark of that disease. The two go together. During 35 years of deficit financing in France, the value of the French franc fell from 32 cents to

about one-third of a cent. In this country, the last 10 years of deficit financing have reduced the value of the American dollar to less than 60 cents.

The worst part of this is that inflation strikes hardest at those who can least afford it; it shrinks savings, life insurance, pensions, and anything else tucked away for a rainy day. As a great Democrat, Bernard Baruch put it: "Anything which saps the value of savings—and inflation is the worst single threat—is the enemy of the aged and those who expect to grow old."

And he added, "and that is everybody in America."

Deficit financing, in the name of social-security, might well combine with inflation to reduce a 60-cent dollar to a 10-cent or 5-cent dollar. Aside from the effect this would have on individual savings, it would deal a near-fatal blow to the economic strength of the Nation as a whole.

A Hoover Commission task force pointed out that the economic strength of the United States has given us victory in two World Wars. That strength is lost if deficit spending and inflation destroy confidence in our Government and our financial structure, both internally and externally. Thus, our national security itself is endangered by a continued policy of deficit spending.

Finally, there is a moral issue in deficit financing. Are we morally justified in passing onto our children and our children's children a gigantic ever-increasing national debt that must be paid for in generations to come, in the sweat of their brows? Even today the man who works 5 days a week, works Monday and part of Tuesday each week for his Government in order to pay taxes. One need not work 100 percent of the time, Monday through Friday, to arrive at a totalitarian welfare state. Such a course is as undemocratic as it is immoral. No. Deficit financing is not the answer.

There is a third alternative, the middle way. And that is to reduce Federal spending to what we as a nation can afford.

Because it must be done by us, here and now, it is the hardest course of all.

Several Senators have indicated that as much as \$6,000,000,000 can be cut from the present budget without injury to a single essential program. Such a cut would bring about an approximate balance of the budget for the coming fiscal year. I give my wholehearted support to this program. I shall do all in my power as ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to see that it is carried out.

As stated previously, during the Eightieth Congress, controlled by Republicans, we balanced the budget. We even reduced the debt substantially. I had the honor to be chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations at that time, and I can state authoritatively that just as much spending pressure was exerted then as is being generated now. Yet a glance at the record will show that a balanced budget and debt reduction were accomplished during those years. This must be done now, too.

Here in brief form, are ways in which this can be accomplished:

First. Reduce the ordinary peacetime expenditures of the Government. These items, which are not related to past or future wars, have risen from \$6,700,000,000 in 1948 to an estimated \$12,300,000,000 in 1951, an increase of \$5,600,000,000 in 2 years.

Second. Cut out the new programs until we can afford them. The President in his 1951 budget asks for more than \$950,000,000 to finance 34 entirely new spending programs. How can we afford these?

Third. Reduce our ridiculous subsidy hand-outs which are costing us hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Let us protect the farmers. There is no necessity for ruining the national economy to do so. It is time for the planners to remember that Jefferson once said "Were we directed from Washington where to sow and where to reap, we should soon want bread."

Fourth. Reduce our grant-in-aid hand-outs. This program costs the taxpayers over one and one-half billion dollars annually. Several States have had the courage to renounce this device by which Federal controls are extended and have called the extension of Federal aid to States wasteful, unnecessary, and destructive of the American system of government. They have called upon Congress to stop or reduce such offered aid and suggested that the National Government limit itself to matters of purely national concern. Most States are in an excellent financial condition. Let us give back to the States their rights and prerogatives.

Fifth. Reduce Federal personnel. In 1932 there were somewhat more than 500,000 Federal employees. By 1939 this number had nearly doubled. Today it is almost four times as high, or nearly 2,000,000.

I commend the House of Representatives for the adoption of the so-called Jensen amendment. It was offered by the distinguished Representative from Iowa, Mr. BEN JENSEN, and it was adopted by the House of Representatives by an almost unanimous Republican vote, and with some 50 Democrats voting in favor of it. A study of the Jensen amendment discloses as intelligent an approach to the problem of reducing Federal employment rolls as we have seen offered in Congress.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In order to reduce Government personnel, it is essential to have the cooperation and leadership of the executive branch, is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, it is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Congress alone cannot do it as intelligently as it should be done. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The Jensen amendment puts a limitation on rehiring when vacancies occur. It is perhaps the most painless and scientific approach to the problem which has been proposed so far. I do not know whether it is the whole answer, but certainly it is the best approach I have seen. It is a common-

sense approach to a problem which has been a bugaboo for years.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Jensen amendment would require that the first 10 percent of vacancies in each department be not filled; is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. It would give an incentive to those who are still employed in a department to do a better job, so that they may succeed to a little better position, would it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it would. I believe it would combine a method of reduction in Federal personnel with an incentive for the remaining employees to do their best work.

Mr. BRICKER. Those who remained would realize that no political appointee would be brought in to succeed the person who had left the department?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The Government would get a double advantage. It would provide incentive and bring about a reduction in personnel.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. We have been aimlessly trying to find a way to reduce the number of Federal employees without, at the same time, being subjected to pressure from certain groups. It seems to me that the so-called Jensen amendment is an excellent approach to the problem.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Consideration should be given to one question, however, which was brought up in the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations. For example, it is possible that 50 percent of the electricians employed in the Boston Navy Yard might either resign or leave their employment. If only 1 electrician in 10 could be rehired, it might well hold up the whole line of work in the navy yard. So that while the principle of the Jensen amendment is sound, it must be adjusted to fit local conditions in order to be practical.

Mr. BRIDGES. It can be so adjusted. I am sure that what the Senator has cited is an extreme case. I do not think of many situations where all or 50 percent of the electricians or any other class of employees on a project would resign.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Does the Senator have information as to the percentage of resignations or vacancies which occur over a period of a year in Federal employment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not have the figures before me. However, I am informed that there is a turn-over of about 2 percent a month. Therefore, it seems to me that a 10-percent cut could be accomplished in a fiscal year without any great harm being done to anyone. Whenever there is talk about economy, people are inclined to say, "Well, you are for economy, but you are talking in general terms." Mr. President, specifically, I am pointing out methods—and I have enumerated them 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10—of how we can reduce Govern-

ment expenditures, if there is a will in Congress to do so. The burden cannot fall alone on the shoulders of the minority party. The minority, after all, is in the minority. There must be support not only from the minority party, but from the majority as well. If we have the will to do it, it can be done.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. It might be said, too, that no one would be laid off if no replacements were made. I say this because there has been some concern expressed on the part of the younger veterans. They have expressed apprehension that because they have obtained jobs in the Government since the end of the war they have no seniority. Therefore if anyone is to be laid off, the younger veterans would be the first to be laid off. Of course, if a veteran has a disability rating, he is retained, and someone in the younger working class or group is the first to lose his job. Therefore considerable concern is expressed by that type of worker that a curtailment in the number of employees would immediately put the younger persons out of their job.

However, if we were to provide that no replacement was to be made when an employee retired because of age, or when a vacancy occurred by reason of death, this new class of worker who recently came on the payroll would not be affected. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. What he suggests would overcome the usual objection when reductions in personnel are planned. When a reduction of 5 or 10 percent in Government personnel is ordered, the employees with the least seniority, consisting usually of veterans and younger men, are the first to be discharged. Under the so-called Jensen amendment when a vacancy occurred by reason of resignation or death, the vacancy would not be filled immediately, either from a civil-service list or through political appointment because it would be possible to fill only 1 in every 10 vacancies that occurred up to 10 percent of the total. In other words, there would be provided a painless method, as I see it, of reducing the Federal payroll by approximately 200,000 employees. As I said, I should like to commend the able Member of the House of Representatives for his sound approach to the problem.

Sixth. Generally eliminate contract authorization except in special instances. This is a legislative device by which the costs do not show during the year the power to obligate the money is given. We only hoodwink ourselves when we use this I O U device instead of making appropriations.

I have seen, as all other Members of the United States Senate have seen many times, Senators rise when a bill is pending, and say, "This bill carries no appropriation; it is merely an authorization." So they allay the fears of the frugal by saying it carries no appropriation. Immediately after the bill is passed they come before the Committee on Appropriations and say, "Well, now, the Con-

gress has authorized this amount. If Congress did not intend that the money should be spent, it never would have authorized it. You gentlemen are under a moral obligation to make the appropriation." They turn it around and it works both ways.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Is it not a fact that in the case of some of the contract authorizations, it has been represented that it would be several years in the future before there would be any necessity for the projects to come into full fruition, or to be developed or finally to be accomplished? Is not that true?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. In this period, when we are running a big deficit, is it not practical for the Congress to recheck and rechannel some of the authorizations, or lay them on the shelf, until the Federal budget can be brought into some type of balance?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think that is one of the most constructive things that could be done. The distinguished President pro tempore will agree with me, because he has been bothered with the same problem, that if we are ever to get an answer to the problem we are facing, there could not be a more constructive act for the Congress than to authorize a study of projects which have been authorized, with the object, if it is possible to do so, of recalling or repealing some of the authorizations. Or we could at least postpone some of them until a future date when we could afford them. In that way we would relieve the necessity for the appropriation of a great deal of money.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does not the Senator agree that the most potent argument for a contract authorization is not that it will not be paid off for 4 or 5 years, as has been suggested by the Senator, but that it will not cost us anything until after the next election?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is true only too often.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator agree that the argument urged in the last week on the floor of the Senate for the adoption of point 4 in the ECA bill was exactly along that line?

Twenty-five million dollars is authorized as a lick and a promise, and many projects are started, so that when the next bill comes before the Congress, no doubt it will take several hundred million dollars to complete that which has been begun with an open-end authorization.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with that absolutely. That is the theory, and the problem we face.

Mr. BRICKER. We have had the same argument with respect to authorizations and appropriations bills. I am thinking particularly of the housing bill, which, the Senator remembers, was considered a short time ago, and which be-

fore it is finally consummated will cost approximately \$15,000,000,000, or \$20,000,000,000. The cost cannot be calculated because of the variable material costs which must be considered within the period of the duration of the law. In the beginning the cost will be small, the next year it will be more, and it will run into hundreds of millions of dollars before it is finished.

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely; the housing legislation is a fine example.

Mr. BRICKER. It is impossible to stop a program of that kind after it gets started because of the pressure of the minority groups which benefit.

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely. And talking about pressure, let me say one more thing to the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I think it was in 1947 when a certain item was before the Committee on Appropriations. The committee had not acted on it. The House had cut the item from \$36,000,000 to \$33,500,000, or approximately that amount. It was about 8 percent. The department involved proceeded to dismiss a much larger percentage of its field workers than was necessary. In the 3 days from Friday until the following Monday I received more than 5,000 communications addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

A very interesting thing happened, which I should like to cite as an example of what we are up against in a representative government. I could not send telegrams back to this large number of people, or send them individual letters. But I did send a mimeographed letter, and more than 300—I have forgotten the odd number—of the 5,680, took the time and trouble to sit down and write me that they had never sent me any such telegram. That is what the Congress faces from pressure groups. There is not only honest pressure, but there is dishonest pressure. I believe what I have cited is typical of what is going on all the time.

Mr. BRICKER. I think we have an example in the Senate this week of pressure in connection with the postal cut. The letters are coming in by the thousands every day. I think it is the best organized campaign we have experienced in years.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is absolutely correct. Here are other ways to cut spending:

Seventh. Fry the fat out of the pork-barrel bills. Our programs for river and harbor development, flood control, rural electrification, power development, and reclamation are vastly extended beyond either our present needs or present ability to finance them. In many sections we are reclaiming more land to irrigate larger areas, to produce more crops, to create bigger surpluses, to pay larger subsidies, to increase the national debt. And then we burn the surpluses, and pay the owners of the reclaimed land to curtail production to increase the debt some more.

Eighth. Eliminate bureaucratic Government with its red tape and its duplications and wasteful management. To cite a few examples—and this is amazing:

Duplicating: The Army and Air Force have 140 printing and duplicating plants, the Navy 86, Commerce 26, Interior 15, to mention a few.

I repeat, the Army and Air Force have 140 printing and duplicating establishments; the Navy has 86; the Commerce Department has 26; the Interior Department has 15. People believe we have a Government Printing Office in Washington, but very few have any idea that the Department of Commerce alone has 26 different printing plants scattered over the country.

For instance, to show how they are located, some 61 are in Washington, 23 in San Francisco, 25 in Philadelphia, 16 in Chicago, 16 in New York, and so on.

Overlapping of functions: The committee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] found that 37 agencies carried on activities in public health, 22 in housing, 27 in labor relations, 64 in business relations, 37 in foreign aid, 24 in map making, 21 in transportation, 16 in education, and so forth.

Mr. President, that shows the number of departments there are running off in different directions, heading for the same goal.

Red tape: Now I wish to talk just a moment about red tape. It takes as many as 35 separate steps to process a routine letter received by the State Department. In another agency there are over 100 steps taken in processing an application for employment. And this does not include a single interview or examination.

Purchase orders: Half of the 3,000,000 purchase orders by Federal civilian agencies are for purchase of \$10 or less. Yet it costs the Government more than \$10 to perform the paper work alone on each of these purchase orders.

Vacant beds: On June 30, 1948, there were 100,000 vacant beds in Federal hospitals. Nevertheless, the lower House passed a bill on April 24, 1950, authorizing construction for 16,000 additional beds.

Insurance: The VA needs four times as many employees to handle its insurance workload as do private companies doing comparable work.

Supplies: A Hoover Commission task force report reveals that a \$1 item costs an agency from \$1.41 to \$1.84 because of Federal handling and storage costs.

Hundreds of such items of waste, duplication and bogging down in the mire of red tape are available to the investigator. They go on unchecked for the most part. There are more of them every day.

A United Press item of March 13 revealed that one Government agency has a 93-year supply of light bulbs, a 247-year supply of loose-leaf binders, and enough filler paper for the binders to last 168 years. Those are the facts. What happens in the average department in Government? It approaches the end of the year. It is so anxious to get its next year's appropriation that if it has a few thousands dollars left over, instead of being proud to return the amount to the United States Treasury, it starts buying filler paper or something of that kind, until it gets, a 1-year sup-

ply ahead, or as much as 168 years' supply ahead. That is another reason the Government is running into the red today.

MOTOR VEHICLES

It is estimated the Government operates approximately 2,000,000 motor vehicles; yet no one agency has any idea of where they are or who runs them. There is not one agency or one person in the Federal Government who has any idea about where they all are. That is a problem in connection with which an over-all supervision would bring about very desirable results.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. As I remember the employment figures, that is about one automobile for every Government employee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. That is a pretty high average.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is a pretty high average. Of course, my employment total does not include military personnel. The 2,000,000 motor vehicles would include military vehicles.

ACCOUNTING PRACTICES

The Government of the United States is often referred to as the largest business in the world, but no business could possibly survive if it used the bookkeeping procedures employed by the Federal Government. The collectors of internal revenue impose most precise requirements on how a taxpayer should keep his books, but, as T. Coleman Andrews, who is chairman of the American Institute of Accountants' Committee on Governmental Accounting, has said:

It—the Government—has not itself had an accounting system worthy of the name. There is no central accounting department and no officer solely responsible for seeing that regular understandable reports are submitted to the people, Congress, or the President on how the taxpayers' money is being used. Only a few years ago the Treasury announced a surplus when actually a deficit existed which was several times the reported surplus. If the average business firm kept no more appropriate and informative books than the Government, it would soon be bankrupt for lack of financial data which management needs to do its job successfully.

HOUSING

There are a total of 45 different agencies or offices concerned with housing, of which the Senator from Ohio, who has made a study of that problem, is probably aware.

Often these agencies are unknown to one another. It would appear that they could be consolidated into one or two central housing agencies; thereby making bureau chiefs out of agency heads at great savings in salary and the trappings that go with high office in Washington.

TYPEWRITERS

The Government owns more than three typewriters for every person on the Federal payroll who knows how to type. Did Senators know that for every clerk, every stenographer, every secretary, every person in the employ of the United States Government who can operate a typewriter, the Government of the United

States has three typewriters? The Government owns three typewriters for every employee who knows how to type.

Ninth. I place last on the list of methods to balance the budget that concerning our defense expenditure outlay, in which I shall include our foreign commitments. Together these total roughly half of our Federal budget. Because they relate to the national security they are considered untouchable. This unfounded assumption has already cost us billions of dollars. Certainly anyone who has ever been a member of the armed services can attest to the fact that waste is ever present—in time, materials, and manpower.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I wonder if the Senator is aware of a press release which was issued a few days ago, which set forth that there are something over 4,000 more telephones in the Pentagon Building today than there were there in the height of wartime?

Mr. BRIDGES. No, I am not. But I am not surprised at that figure.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The Pentagon switchboard is the largest switchboard in the world, or so it is reported.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator for that statement. What the Senator has pointed out is typical. The statement respecting the telephones is news to me. However, I would have been willing to guess that the number of telephones in the Pentagon was no less than at the height of the war, but I could not dream there were 4,000 more now than then. It certainly shows the trend of the Government today.

The Secretary of Defense is to be commended for some of the economies he has accomplished in his establishment. Nothing I say here is intended in any way to belittle his achievements.

But much more can be done and must be done. When we voted for unification of the armed forces, we believed, as was stated on the floor of the Senate, we would have one system instead of the two then in being—the Army and the Navy. Instead, we now have four systems—the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We have four agencies there where we had two before. We now have more personnel offices, more budget offices, more accounts offices, more supply channels than we had before unification was brought about. Where we had two types of uniform we now have three. The Air Force now even plans to paint its vehicles stratoblue instead of the present olive drab. That is unification.

I voted for unification. I helped with the unification bill. I hoped we would obtain unification, and that it would bring about increased efficiency and eliminate a great deal of waste and inefficiency. There has been some increase in efficiency, but I think much more has to be done in the way of elimination of inefficiency. In some instances agencies, rather than having eliminated waste and inefficiency, have done the reverse.

Throughout the United States the Army still maintains a tremendous num-

ber of forts, camps, and installations. They have utterly no relation to our national defense needs. Only installations which are integrated in our overall plans for the defense of America can, in my opinion, be justified.

For instance, in some sections of the country Indian forts were built for use in the days when we were fighting the Indians. There is no reason on earth for maintaining those forts today. Soldiers cannot be trained in them now. Soldiers must now be trained in large training camps.

We have forts in existence on the Canadian border. We have some, even in New England, the existence of which cannot be justified for any military or other reasons. If we want to economize there are many ways by which we can do so in the defense establishment without doing any damage to the national security.

Primarily our objective in defense preparations must be to balance out expenditures against our vital needs in the light of our economic ability to support such vast costs. We must remember that we can spend ourselves into becoming an economically weak war machine.

With this in mind I intend shortly to introduce proposed legislation calling for a reevaluation of our air defense needs and war potential. It is high time we took stock of ourselves again in the manner suggested by the Joint Congressional Aviation Board and the Finletter Commission.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New Hampshire has suggested that we must spend our means for our vital needs. Is it not essential that we consider the national security first? If we consider the national security first, then the advancement of our way of life by the development of our resources and improvements for the benefit of all of us as individuals will come with the peace and security which is acquired. But at the present time does not the great problem arise from the fact that we are trying to carry two buckets of water, one in either hand, one representing security and the other representing improvements in our way of life at home, and that the two buckets together are too heavy to carry? Is not that the cause of our basic problem?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is what brings about our basic problem, yes. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The wanton spending of the Democratic administrations is playing into the hands of the Communists. In a speech in 1924, Nikolai Lenin, patron saint of Soviet Russia, discussed the Communist timetable for the conquest of American democracy. This was many years ago. He made a prophecy that America would exhaust its people and its resources by wanton spending in the guise of national defense. He advised his comrades to

keep an unremitting pressure on the United States. He predicted that such pressure would compel our Nation to spend itself into destruction. Stalin recalls Lenin's prediction. He must watch our financial antics with grim satisfaction.

Mr. President, we must remain strong; but we must also remember Lenin's prophecy. To over-extend our economic ability to wage war might exact as fearful a toll as lack of preparedness itself. We over-extend ourselves when we continue year after year to spend more than we can pay for.

The budget can be balanced this year, if we have the will to do it. It will require courage to do so, for it is not easy to vote against popular local handouts.

Yet public opinion, I believe, is becoming increasingly antagonistic to unwarranted Federal spending. In a recent poll—I do not place too much dependence upon polls, since a year and a half ago—67 percent of those queried believed the Government was spending too much, 18 percent said the total was about right, 4 percent said not enough was being spent, and 11 percent were undecided. Significantly, substantially over half of those in the middle-income and lower-income groups believed too much was being spent.

Yet constantly we are today being besieged by pressure groups demanding their share of the handout booty. Despite this, there are millions of Americans who are not seeking Government help; that do not want false financial assistance at someone else's expense.

But the Federal financial crisis will not be licked until the American people refuse handouts, in the knowledge that there is no such thing as something for nothing, in the realization that the taxpayer must foot the bill for every Government gift, in the understanding that the Federal Government does not produce, it only uses up what the people produce.

People are beginning to understand the problem. We need more men, though, like the man in Casper, Wyo., who wrote the Secretary of Defense recently:

We saw our air base taken off the active list. When you took a stand for economy . . . we felt you were taking a stand for the things this country believes in and holds important.

Or the city officials of Winnetka, Ill., who rejected an allotment of \$316,000 for a new post office, when they were notified by the distinguished majority leader of the Senate. They said:

The country needs many things more urgently than Winnetka needs a post office, among them a spirit of economy in Washington.

The citizens of my State—the State of New Hampshire—will contribute more than \$123,000,000 toward the 1951 budget. That is a small part of the total, but consider this: The State government of New Hampshire is operating an austerity program, on an annual budget of approximately \$50,000,000. The legislature, presently in session, is attempting to devise ways and means of raising

funds to provide our school teachers with pensions and our State employees with salary adjustments.

People in New Hampshire have no complaint about contributing their share to our national budget for financing past wars and the possibility of future wars. These are proper functions of the Federal Government, but the people of New Hampshire are demanding that the Federal Government stop usurping the right of States to handle their own affairs.

They know that the hand-out policy of the Federal Government will react to the detriment of New Hampshire people and the entire population.

They know that the Federal tax dollar can never return in full to the people.

They know that administrative costs, waste, duplication, and the frills of Federal Government bite ever increasing chunks out of the tax pie.

They know the increasing interest on the Federal debt, increasing Federal control on State affairs, and an increasing dependence on Federal hand-outs will sap our national strength.

They want us to do something about it.

With this kind of support, Mr. President, the Congress can solve our present financial crisis. We can balance the budget by reducing Federal aids, subsidies, and loans, by eliminating excess personnel and unnecessary services, and by cutting ruthlessly the pork-barrel legislation.

Simultaneously we can cut down our paradoxical program which, for example, finds one agency telling farmers how to grow bigger crops, which is a good thing, but is inconsistent with the work of another agency in limiting production through acreage control and other regulations; which finds the Government controlling private credit, but expanding the public debt; which finds the Government subsidizing airlines and road transport to a point where competition threatens to bring about bankruptcy or new subsidies for railroads.

The Congress can balance the budget this year, but it must be supported wholeheartedly by public opinion; and, to be effective, it must be nonpartisan.

Before this is possible, the American taxpayer's reawakened understanding of the value of a dollar must be part of the Federal financial picture.

Reduced spending, accompanied by limitations on the functions of Government, is the hard way; but it is the only path to real national security. The very existence of our Nation may well depend on what every American thinks and does in this situation—a situation which George Washington had in mind when he said in his Farewell Address:

Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of debt.

Never has Washington's advice had greater significance. Never has there been greater need for a united front against this enemy from within—financial chaos.

Mr. President, I shall never forget a statement which was made by a distinguished Member of the Senate in the

spending days of the thirties, when I was in the Senate. He was a very able Democratic Senator from Mississippi, the late Pat Harrison. Pat Harrison said, and I often recall it:

This country can no more spend its way to prosperity than a drunken man can drink himself sober.

Mr. President, if the statement of principle enunciated at that time by Pat Harrison could be taken to heart by the Members of this Congress, it could be a very useful motto today.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his clear and thoughtful analysis of the economic problems facing the country at the present time, especially in connection with the budget which we anticipate passing upon soon.

However, I find it rather difficult to acquaint the American people with the facts which will cause them to have an appreciation of the meaning of deficit financing and the danger attending it. The people have been rather anesthetized by indirect taxes; for today, so far as direct taxes are concerned, the people feel only a slight part of the total tax burden which presents the total cost of the Federal Government.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire agree with me that the experience with Government bonds of small denominations which were purchased in a spirit of patriotism during the war some 10 years ago, and now are being cashed, brings home rather clearly the danger of deficit financing? During the war our people paid, for instance, \$75 for a Government bond which was to be redeemed at \$100 in 10 years. However, at the present time every dollar of the maturity value of such a bond is worth only 60 cents in terms of the value of a dollar 10 years ago. In other words, today that bond is worth only a little more than half of what its maturity value was worth at that time; the owner of the bond finds his present return diminished to that extent, in addition to the taxes which have to be paid upon the bonds.

Furthermore, in the case of life-insurance policies which were purchased some 10 years ago, the experience of today is that they are presently worth only approximately one-half of what they were worth at that time.

So, Mr. President, if the American people could be awakened by having to pay a larger part of the total tax burden by direct taxes, rather than by indirect taxes, and if they could again have brought home to them how much less they can buy today with a dollar than they could when they invested their dollars in insurance policies or in Government bonds, I believe there would be an awakening on the part of the public generally and a tax consciousness which would undergird the Senate and the House of Representatives in their efforts to balance the budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct.

A few days ago there was brought to my attention an instance which points up the situation very well: A man who had been a hard worker and thrifty, died very suddenly. He left a widow and four children. All his life he had put his savings into life insurance. That life insurance was written in such a way that, on the basis of the value of the dollar at the time when he made his plans, his family could have been cared for adequately. Today, with the shrinkage in the buying value of the dollar, and the deficit fiscal situation, we find that the wife, who is a partial cripple, and her family are hopelessly in debt. Two of the children probably will have to be either placed in a home or adopted. Yet that man, a good American citizen, had faith in his Government when he made provision for his family. He thought he was caring for them adequately. We have seen the Federal fiscal situation so change the picture that it makes his family almost a relief case today.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the direct result of deficit financing, which is weakening the value of the dollar.

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator further agree that the use of social-security money, as it has been used in deficit financing during the past few years, has further weakened our whole economic system and has not really given security to those who have a false feeling of security because of what Government promises them in the future, and has it not likewise deprived the hard-working American citizen of the opportunity of building his own security for himself and those dependent upon him against the day of need?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do. I agree, absolutely. I believe in social security. But the person who depends on social security and says, "Well, it does not make any difference to me whether the Government goes on a spending spree or not," is going to be fooled. He has got to remember that the only possibility in the world that he will be taken care of in his old age, through the social security program is the ability of the United States Government to tax someone else to pay him.

Mr. BRICKER. In other words, social security is absolutely dependent, if it is to be real social security, upon political security and political liberty, is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely; political security and political liberty are the fundamental essentials.

SOVIET PLANS FURTHER AGGRESSION FROM ITS CHINA BASE—ARTICLE FROM LABOR'S MONTHLY SURVEY

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, from Labor's

Monthly Survey, a publication of the American Federation of Labor, the issue of April-May 1950, volume 2, No. 4-5 which was released on May 8, the paragraph dealing with our far-eastern policy, which begins on page 5 and continues to the top of page 7. I think Members of the Senate and of the press who have not read it will find it very enlightening.

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

SOVIET PLANS FURTHER AGGRESSION FROM ITS CHINA BASE

Soviet control in China follows the pattern familiar in Europe. Stalin's puppet Mao carries out his orders, and in return Stalin supplies him with the armed force necessary to keep him in power and to carry forward the Soviet conquests. Soviet planes and equipment are being furnished, Soviet generals direct Red China's armies. From its China base, the Soviet reaches for Indochina, plans a drive into Tibet, infiltrates Thailand, has already conquered the island of Hainan, looks toward a drive on Formosa, the last island stronghold of the legitimate Government of China. By fomenting civil war in Indochina and attacking the Viet Nam government which is a member of the French Union, Stalin accomplishes a double purpose: He forces the French to drain their military strength away from Europe, and also prepares a further Communist advance into southeast Asia, toward Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, with the goal of outflanking India. And India is the key to this vital southeastern area, rich in so many essential raw materials. This is an area of great danger to the United States of America, at the western door to our own country.

It is significant that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions is sending a delegation to India and the Far East preliminary to setting up a branch office there. Such an office will be a vital rallying point for free-trade unionists who seek to defeat Communist efforts to capture the Indian and other trade-union movements.

In China, the ruthless Communist conquest has brought the people to poverty and starvation. It is estimated that about 10,000,000 Chinese will die of starvation this year, and the Soviet has refused to permit the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization to send food to them. Many of the free-trade unionists who sought to better the conditions of Chinese workers have been murdered in cold blood. Liu Sung-shan, veteran trade-union leader revered by all, had been three times Chinese workers' delegate to the International Labor Organization. He thought he could carry on his trade-union activities under the Communist government as he would under any other, and continued to help the Chinese workers. He was beheaded by the Communist authorities.

On the island of Formosa are the headquarters of the anti-Communist underground movements active on the mainland. Formosa is the key to maintenance of legitimate governments in the Philippines, Japan, and the far eastern islands. Anti-Communists everywhere can help by aid to these resistance organizations. Here is the last chance for the United States to take a stand against the spread of Communist aggression across the Pacific to our own shores.

DEATH WARRANT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS?

The United Nations was set up 5 years ago to suppress acts of aggression and bring about settlement of international disputes "by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law." All members, including USSR, pledged

themselves to respect "the territorial integrity and political independence of any state" and to refrain from the use of force. Stalin now seeks to remove from the United Nations the legitimate government of China, a charter member, and replace it with the usurping Communist regime, imposed on the people of China by military conquest in violation of the United Nations charter. He hopes by so doing to secure for himself two of the five veto powers on the Security Council.

As the chairman of the Federation's Free Trade Union Committee points out, for the United Nations to agree to any such maneuver "would be tantamount to signing its own death warrant." If, instead of striving to protect weaker states and insisting on law and justice, the United Nations becomes a means of endorsing aggression and recognizing states set up by military conquest, it will follow the League of Nations to the scrap heap.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the motion to take up S. 1728, the FEPC bill. I hope that ultimately cloture may prevail and we will have a chance to discuss the bill on its merits and to vote on it. I am in favor of its passage.

On February 8, 1946, I offered two amendments to Senate bill 101 which was then under discussion and which was the FEPC bill of the Seventy-ninth Congress. These amendments had to do with the enforcement provisions of the bill. They were not very dissimilar from those which we are now discussing as a part of the present bill. At that time I stated that when I was the Governor of Massachusetts in 1943 I was very much disturbed by a report in a New York newspaper regarding race riots in Boston. That experience gave me an inkling of how easily misunderstandings can arise. Boston is truly a metropolitan city, made up as it is of citizens of many different racial and religious beliefs, but we have never had great dissension because of those differing beliefs. At that time in 1943 I appointed a commission of five distinguished citizens of different religious and racial beliefs and asked them to verify the truth of the charges. They investigated carefully and reported. The charges did have a slight basis in fact but were greatly exaggerated. What basis in fact they did have could be ascribed to the ordinary exuberance of 16- and 17-year-old boys in a crowded neighborhood. But, the commission that I appointed did so much good work in determining the truth in this instance and was so universally accepted by our citizens that I requested them to continue their work. That commission is still functioning, having functioned under one Republican and two Democratic governors since I left office. The recommendations that this commission makes from time to time emphasize education and understanding as the greatest means of eliminating racial and religious jealousies.

Mr. President, in that connection, I found a note in the Boston Daily Globe of Friday, May 12, which came to my desk today, in which it is pointed out that the United Community Services of Boston, which is our community-fund effort in Boston, had just presented 10 awards to Negroes for aid in the community. That was done because of their meritorious contributions to community relations. That is the spirit we want to foster and encourage if we can.

Today the world is still torn by the effects of World War II. While in some lands the shooting still goes on, for us the shooting war is over—I hope forever. But, at an increasing tempo we are in a cold war of ideologies. If we are not going to allow that war to become hot, we must remain strong; we must strive with every means at our command to show to the other nations of the world the principles and ideals for which we stand. This can be done best through education. The object which we seek in this legislation can best be accomplished by education. I feel confident that it can be accomplished; but in seeking to make it more of a reality we want to be sure that our Nation endeavors continuously to do its utmost to end any discrimination that may arise within our borders. We must study again those words contained in the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

I have always felt very keenly that if we consider the proper interpretation of these words "all men are created equal" and if men have among their "unalienable rights," "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" then we must agree that any discrimination because of religion, or race, or color, or national origin is not compatible.

In our State of Massachusetts I know we are making progress toward better understanding among our citizens. I have always been proud of how the various groups that comprise Massachusetts work together. I am proud of this fact because about 60 percent of our citizens were either born in another country or are the sons and daughters of citizens born in other countries. So, we have in Massachusetts truly representative citizens of the United States in the full sense of that word. Our Massachusetts Constitution has this to say:

The end of the institution, maintenance, and administration of government is to secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights, and the blessings of life.

Today the Constitution of Massachusetts is the oldest written constitution in the world in practical operation. I am confident that the good citizens who formed it did not have in mind any discrimination against anyone. It seems

to me perfectly clear when they mention "their natural rights and blessings of life" that they meant all men and women have a right to be treated alike without discrimination and that it is the duty of government to see that they have this opportunity. The Constitution of Massachusetts goes on to say "and whenever these great objects are not obtained people have a right to alter the government and to take measures necessary for their safety, prosperity and happiness."

The older I become and the longer I remain in public life, I cannot stress too strongly that laws can never replace mutual understanding and confidence. This can only be done by education and by a willingness among individuals to cooperate with each other, to live peacefully with each other, and to understand the hopes and aspirations of their friends and neighbors. This is the fundamental thought that must underlie any legislation of the character of FEPC. Experience has shown, as I shall point out later, that some compulsory feature of FEPC legislation is highly desirable but the mere fact that out of the many cases which have been heard none has yet been taken to court shows that conciliation has been extremely successful. Conciliation in its best sense means mutual understanding and a will to cooperate.

Ten States have now passed FEPC legislation. In eight of those States the laws are very similar to the bill that we now have under discussion. In two of those States—Indiana and Wisconsin—there are no compulsory features. The experience of four of those States, i. e., New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington, is necessarily limited because their laws were passed only last year. However, there has been sufficient practical experience in the States of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut to give some very good indication of how their laws are working. In each of these States commissions have been established. In each of these States these commissions have the duty of attempting to end the alleged discrimination by conference and conciliation. So far no cases in any State, as far as I have learned, have been brought before the courts or had the compulsory feature in the law operate. In every instance satisfactory results, in the opinion of the commission, have been accomplished through the conciliatory and conference sections of the act.

Each of these commissions emphasize in their reports, and in the correspondence that I have had with them, the fact that the existence of the compulsory feature has permitted the commission to accomplish the results without its actual use. This fact is emphasized by the statement from the administrative assistant in Wisconsin, where there is no compulsory feature. I quote one paragraph from Miss Virginia Huebner's letter to me of January 27, 1950:

The need for guaranteeing equality of job opportunity for all persons who qualify having been clearly demonstrated, it is my personal belief that defining the so-called compulsory provision as a last measure when all other informal methods of persuasion and

conciliation fail to achieve the desired results, really dignifies the fair employment procedure and stimulates interest, action, and respect. Such provision, however, has not been written into our present Wisconsin act.

This year, in order to find out how the commissions were working in the States where they have been set up, I wrote to the governors in those States. I should now like to read to the Senate some of the answers which I received.

Chapter 118 of the Laws of 1935 in New York, the law that bears the name of our distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], was the first in operation. Under date of January 7, 1950, Governor Dewey wrote me in part as follows:

In New York the law has now been operating for 4½ years. The commission consisted of fine, enthusiastic people. But they were also restrained and intelligent people. As a result, every case that ever went to the board, at least until recently, was conciliated privately without ever a hearing by the full board. That means, of course, that no orders were ever issued, there were no violations of orders, and no legal sanctions have ever been invoked. There has been universal acceptance of the law and barriers in employment have been broken down almost universally by voluntary action following conference.

Senators will note the last sentence, which I shall repeat:

There has been universal acceptance of the law and barriers in employment have been broken down almost universally by voluntary action following conference.

Governor Bowles, of Connecticut, emphasizes in his letter the importance of the work of the commission in Connecticut and states he believes it should be accomplished by a separate commission and not by any existing agency. He also believes that the work should be done quietly and persistently but not with any emphasis on publicity. The report of the commission in Connecticut states in part:

CIVIL RIGHTS IN CONNECTICUT

Connecticut has a fair employment practices act passed in May 1947, administered by the State inter-racial commission. It provides for complaint, investigation and where the commission believes a discriminatory practice has been committed, they attempt to correct it by conciliation, conference or persuasion. Failing this, they are empowered to hold an administrative hearing, issue cease and desist orders, and if necessary call on the courts to enforce these orders.

To date some 140 complaints have been filed under this act and in about 60 percent of these the commission has felt that discriminatory practices had been committed. It was able to adjust these complaints without resort to the hearing procedure except in one complaint which has been scheduled for a hearing. If this hearing is held, it will be the first one in any of the 8 States now having FEPC laws. Features of the Connecticut law are that it covers all employers of five or more. Unlike other States, it does not exempt charitable, educational, religious, and nonprofit enterprises. It also states that discrimination includes separation and segregation. Unlike the other State laws it does not provide criminal penalties or stipulate that pre-employment inquiries or questions in employment interviews regarding applicants' race, religion or color are discriminatory.

The State civil service law (merit system) also has a section forbidding discrimination

against civil service employees or applicants on account of their racial or religious affiliations.

From New Jersey, Governor Driscoll writes as follows:

The 1945 legislature passed an act to prevent and eliminate practices of discrimination in employment (P. L. 1945, c. 169). The law took effect July 1, 1945. In the almost 5 years that have elapsed, the division against discrimination processed a total of 893 individual complaints. Two hundred of these involved inquiries into alleged discriminatory situations other than employment, and these were handled by the division as part of its broader program of studying the problems of discrimination in all fields of human relationships and of fostering, through community effort or otherwise, good will, cooperation and conciliation among all elements of the population of the State.

The division did not once, during this entire period, find it necessary to hold a public hearing or resort to the courts to enforce the provisions of the law. About 50 percent of the complaints filed with the division charging discrimination in employment were found to be justified; discrimination actually did exist. In every instance the division through interpretation, conciliation and mediation, effected adjustments which not only satisfied the complainant, but resulted in a change of the employment policy that had caused the initial complaint.

Some have argued that if cases can successfully be settled on the conference level, then the compulsory feature in the law is unnecessary. The answer to this, of course, is relatively simple. Where all parties to the conference know that enforcement provisions are available, they tend to be much more receptive to settlement agreements. Contrast the experience of organizations which have sought the same ends through a program of education, the only method available to them. I have been informed by representatives of the Urban League, for example, that in the 40 years of that organization's existence it has made relatively little progress, using education tools only, in interpreting to employers and union leadership the real meaning of employment discrimination.

We in New Jersey feel that a fair employment practices law must, if it is to be effective, have compulsory features. At the same time, the law must be sufficiently elastic to permit wide discretionary powers in the administrator before legal sanctions are applied.

The debates in Congress will doubtless include the familiar argument that civil rights laws can never eliminate prejudice. In New Jersey we recognize the realities of the situation. We agree that laws cannot of themselves eliminate prejudice. All we are attempting to do is to restrain people who would translate their prejudices into active discrimination and thus interfere with the basic rights of other individuals. We look upon our civil rights laws as a means of reducing the discrimination, just as other laws have been found necessary to control other types of offenses against the social order.

Opponents of FEPC distort the facts in so many ways that it would be impossible for me to give as much information as I should like in this letter. I am therefore taking the liberty of enclosing material prepared by our division against discrimination in the State department of education, in the hope that it may prove helpful to you.

The commission's report from New Jersey substantiates these statements of the Governor. I have the report here if anyone wishes to look at it.

From my own home State of Massachusetts, Mrs. Mildred H. Mahoney, the very capable chairman of our commission, writes in part as follows:

We feel we have been very fortunate indeed in that we have settled 562 cases dealing with employers of over 300,000 employees without recourse to the compulsory features of our act. The wording of the act itself has been of great assistance to us. It states: "After the filing of any complaint, the chairman of the commission shall designate one of the commissioners to make, with the assistance of the commission's staff, prompt investigation in connection therewith; and if such commissioner shall determine after such investigation that probable cause exists for crediting the allegations of the complaint, he shall immediately endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practice complained of by conference, conciliation, and persuasion."

This means that the initial handling of the case is done on a conference basis and in a very informal manner. We feel that this approach has had real educational value and that often respondents have been persuaded that discrimination is decidedly undesirable and un-American. This approach is the antithesis of swinging a big stick.

We have also not sought publicity after cases have been settled. A fairly clear account of the operation of the commission's is presented in our annual report of last year and of this year. Since they are both brief, I am enclosing them and also a copy of the law itself.

On Wednesday of last week, I received a telegram from Governor McKay, of Oregon, stating the experience in that State since the law became effective on July 16, 1949. I quote:

Believe Oregon FEPC law working very satisfactorily. Fifteen complaints alleging discrimination filed since law became effective July 16, 1949. Fourteen of these were based on race and one on religious and national origin. Eleven complaints filed against employers and four against labor organizations. In one case it was found there had been no discrimination. One complaint dismissed because of lack of jurisdiction and three were adjusted by conference and conciliation. Ten complaints are pending. Much approval has been expressed for Oregon's legislation.

From Rhode Island on May 12 I received a reply which reads, on pages 10 and 11 of that State's initial report of its fair employment practices commission:

We feel that this law is a profound educational instrument and that the actual working of the law makes it possible for persons of differing racial, religious, and ancestral backgrounds to come to know one another more closely. We have viewed that strained feelings about minority groups have a natural tendency to disappear in the face of mutual understanding among individuals.

In the first 6 months of operation, the commission has processed seven cases of complaints of alleged discriminatory practices in the field of employment. Additional cases were reported to the agency; but not recorded, as conference on the problems disclosed there was no sound evidence of alleged discrimination. It is to be noted, however, that in all such cases, the complainants were fully satisfied in their own minds that they were prejudging the case and acting upon emotion rather than reason. Of all cases received and recorded, all were satisfactorily settled through conference and conciliation and no formal hearings were required. No cases are recorded as settled without the expressed satisfaction of the complainant with

the results. Of the cases against employers, two persons were hired by the employers, one has been assured the next job opportunity, and the others were found to be less qualified than the persons actually hired.

From the State of Washington, Governor Langlie telegraphs as follows:

Our FEPC law passed in 1949. Progress has been satisfactory. No cases have gone to hearing. All settled by conciliatory methods.

Governor Langlie also arranged to have sent to me the final semiannual report of the Washington State Board Against Discrimination in Employment. This report lists a total of 36 formal complaints filed since the board's establishment. Twenty-eight of these complaints have been closed with eight still pending. Of those closed, 24 revealed no discrimination practiced, 1 was closed by conference and conciliation, 3 were closed as having no ground for proper complaint.

Mr. President, I realize that this problem differs in the various sections of the country.

While I feel I cannot reiterate too often that I believe education is the best and most adequate solution to the problem of discrimination, I feel confident that the debates on this subject in the Senate during the 5½ years I have been privileged to be a Member have brought the whole problem more closely to the attention of the people of the country than at any previous time in our history. I feel confident that our citizens want to help to gradually reduce any symptoms of discrimination and to eliminate them just as far as possible. I believe that a Federal law properly, carefully, and sensibly administered by men and women carefully selected, who are willing to listen to all sides of the question will accomplish much in this direction.

For this reason, since I have been in the Senate I have joined in sponsoring FEPC legislation. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, when I first came to the Senate in 1945 I was very much interested in S. 101, the FEPC bill of the Seventy-ninth Congress. When it came up a year later, I submitted two amendments which I thought would make it more workable. In the Eightieth Congress, I was one of the sponsors of S. 984, the FEPC bill of the Eightieth Congress, which was introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] on March 27, 1947. While this bill was favorably reported, I regret to say it did not come up for discussion. Again in the present, the Eighty-first Congress, the Senator from New York introduced S. 174, an FEPC bill almost identical with the one now under discussion. Again I was very glad to be one of the sponsors.

I shall not enter upon a long discussion at this time of the effect of racial discrimination and our relations with other countries of the world because now we are debating our problem here at home. It is a problem for us in the United States. The solution must also be ours. I realize entirely that the problem in the North and the problem in the South are not the same in every respect by any means. I feel, however, that the

problem becomes one for all of us to consider from whatever section of the country we come when we in Congress are asked to consider it. Every question brought before the Congress which involves the rights of any single individual to be free of racial or religious discrimination becomes the problem of every other citizen in the United States.

Mr. President, if we are to advance as the greatest nation the world has ever known, if we are to continue our Government as we know it today, if we are to continue to be a great land of opportunity, we must move forward as one nation without discrimination against any one of our citizens because of race, creed, or color.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss now very briefly the pending motion. It may involve, and I believe it will involve, the first test of an amendment to the rule on cloture, rule 22, which was adopted at the last session of the Senate. I take this opportunity to discuss this briefly because it has always been of interest to me. During my first year in the Senate when I tried to understand the rules I saw that the cloture provisions were not clearly enough worded to prevent endless discussion of the motion to take up if a determined minority resisted. In 1946 I submitted a resolution to amend the rules in an effort to plug the loopholes that permitted this. I submitted it again in 1947. That year the Rules Committee reported a resolution to amend the rules, but no action was taken upon it in the Eightieth Congress. Last year I again joined with others in submitting an identical resolution. This was reported and brought up for discussion. In the debate which followed the Vice President ruled that cloture could be obtained on a motion to take up under the rules then prevailing, when there was no unfinished business pending. I felt he was right, but the Senate overruled him.

As a result of this decision and a long discussion, a petition was circulated for a compromise. That compromise was for a constitutional two-thirds vote on cloture on any business before the Senate, including a motion to take up. This resulted in the Senate voting to amend rule 22 to make it as it presently stands. I did not sign the compromise, as I believed cloture should be obtainable by two-thirds of those present and voting. I cosponsored with the then Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Baldwin, an amendment to effectuate this objective. When this amendment was defeated I voted for the compromise because I felt it was a distinct step forward. It was a step forward in that it clearly made it possible to have a cloture petition on a motion to take up. If this amendment had not been adopted then we would be in the same position today in which we were in 1946 when we debated an amendment to the Chaplain's prayer and an amendment to the Journal for a period of 3 weeks, and then dropped the measure from further discussion because there was no way to end debate on the amendment to the Journal. This was the situation in which the Senate found

itself in the discussion of 1949, after the Vice President's ruling was overturned by a majority of the Senate.

I believe in full and free debate. I do not believe in premature closing of debate. I believe that the rights of the minority should at all times be protected, but I feel that after reasonable discussion there should be some means, if at least two-thirds of the Senate believe the debate should be brought to a close, of bringing the debate to a close and voting the question involved either up or down.

This right to bring debate to a close should not be given to a majority, for it might, by so doing, override to easily the rights of the minority. It might in emotional crises do more harm than good. But we permit two-thirds of Congress to propose amendments to the Constitution, two-thirds of the Senate to ratify treaties and to amend the Senate rules, and two-thirds seems a logical percentage to determine that debate should be brought to a close.

The compromise under which we are now operating requires a constitutional two-thirds. It is an even more severe provision than is required for amending the Constitution. Therefore, no critic can say that the rights of the minority are being trampled upon. I only hope that this amendment to the rule will prove to be a practical step forward in making it possible to expedite the business of the Senate, and in due course to bring the issue to a vote.

I mention this in this discussion because there has been criticism that the change in the rules accomplished last year was not a step forward, but a step backward. I cannot agree with that criticism. If it were a step backward, a petition for cloture would not now be in order, and debate on the "motion to take up" could go on for such an indefinite period that other important Senate business could be blocked, and the bill presently under discussion never be brought up for debate on its merits.

Mr. President, I hope that cloture may prevail, and that S. 1728 may be taken up and favorably acted upon, because I for one would like the opportunity of voting yea upon it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Chester M. Foresman, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

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

A. Garnett Thompson, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia, vice Leslie E. Given, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified. That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James E. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

John A. Lehrs, of Maryland,
Franklin H. Murrell, of California.
J. A. Tuck Sherman, of Pennsylvania.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

To be ensign

Alfred C. Holmes, effective May 25, 1950.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance
Benjamin J. Chester

To be assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance
Preston Holden

To be nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance
Virginia Arnold

To be senior assistant dietitian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Susanne L. Cihunka

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

John B. Vander Edward K. Reid
Albert L. Chapman John D. Porterfield
Henry I. Kohn

To be senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Joseph E. Unsworth

To be senior scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Charles G. Dobro- Willard T. Haskins
volny Clarence M. Tarzwell
Malcolm J. Williams

To be nurse directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

Lucile Petry
Pearl McIver

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Mildred E. Barnett
Ruth E. Anderson

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson; and

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor.

On May 11, 1950:

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Avner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the national health plan for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3258. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 50-22.

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MAY 15, 1950.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable BEN H. GULL as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of the State of Texas, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Eugene Worley, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. GULL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MINIMUM WAGE AND HOUR LEGISLATION

Mr. LUCAS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, last year the House of Representatives passed a

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose blessings and mercies are far beyond our worthiness and our comprehension, we bow before Thee in adoration, in humility, and in supplication.

Give us words with which to praise Thee; give us contrite hearts for our sins against Thee; give us aspiration and strength to serve Thee faithfully.

Take our hands in Thine and lead our faltering steps in the ways of righteousness and peace; take our minds and inspire them with a more spiritual interpretation of life and a finer conception of the brotherhood of man.

Bless us daily with a vivid sense of Thy nearness as we face difficult problems. May the fears and doubts which so often assail our souls be forever dispelled and supplanted by faith and courage.

In the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 10, 1950:

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

very important bill in the field of minimum wage and maximum hour legislation. It will be recalled that the bill which we passed was the Lucas substitute for the Lesinski bill. The Lesinski bill transferred enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the Secretary of Labor out of the hands of the Wage and Hour Administrator. The bill carried more power, as I advised the House at that time, to the Secretary of Labor than any peacetime legislation which had ever been offered in the Congress.

Efforts have been made three times to carry the power of the Wage and Hour Administrator to the Secretary of Labor, giving him the power to regulate American business. Now the House is faced with that same problem again. The President's Reorganization Plan No. 6 provides that the Secretary of Labor shall issue regulations and so forth, and, in fact, administer this act. That organization plan will be up for consideration on the floor of this House on Thursday. I earnestly request each Member of this House to be present at that time in order that we may give full consideration to the measure which I have introduced—House Resolution 522—and understand exactly what will happen if it is not passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered and to revise and extend and make certain additions to those remarks.

AUTHORIZING THE GOVERNOR OF ALASKA TO FIX CERTAIN FEES AND CHARGES WITH RESPECT TO ELECTIONS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2387, an act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "Governor of Alaska" and insert "Alaska Territorial Legislature."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Governor" and insert "legislature."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "Governor" and insert "legislature."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "Governor" and insert "legislature."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF ALPENA, MICH.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2783, an

act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich., with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "without consideration therefor" and insert "for the consideration of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value therefor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

TRANSFERRING A BUILDING IN JUNEAU, ALASKA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3494, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau—Alaska—Camp, together with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "without charge" and insert "in consideration of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

INDIAN LIVESTOCK LOANS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5097, an act for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Lines 3 and 4, strike out "at prevailing market prices" and insert "by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

Line 8, after "ratified", insert "Provided, That hereafter the value of such livestock for the purposes of any such cash settlement shall be based on prevailing market prices in the area and shall be ascertained by a committee composed of three members, one of whom shall be selected by the superintendent of the particular agency, one of whom shall be selected by the chairman of the tribal council, and one of whom shall be selected by the other two members."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

PAYMENT FROM FUNDS TO THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 1354, an act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "alive on June 30, 1948" and insert "living on the date of the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "before June 30, 1948" and insert "prior to the date of the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "June 30; 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "before June 30, 1948" and insert "prior to the date of the approval of this act."

Page 4, lines 8 and 9, strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act."

Page 4, line 25, strike out "section" and insert "act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Tuesday, May 16, following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday, May 16, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REPUBLICAN POLICIES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues and of the country the similarity of the mask behind which the high command of the Republican Party is now hiding to that which it wore in the late twenties when it plunged this country into the greatest depression and the darkest period of hopeless despair we have ever known. I was of the generation engulfed by the catastrophic depression, the generation wrecked by the high command of the Republican Party, and I remember only too vividly how the depression started. It started in the same

kind of talk of economy that we are hearing now—a false, selfish, one-sided economy, it is true, but that was the ugly side of the face that the high command of the Republican Party hid behind the mask. It talked glibly of economy and efficiency, and it practised economy by reducing wages to increase profits and it practised efficiency by sending in the efficiency-wrecking crews to find more ways of increasing the human work load. Then, inevitably, came unemployment and the crash.

I am for economy, but it must be an honest economy. I will have nothing to do with the false economy of the high command of the Republican Party which is based upon the daring and, I would say, the sacrilegious assumption, that God intended that even here in our American democracy a few men and women should enjoy all the cream and the rest of American manhood, womanhood, and childhood should be left fighting for a taste of the skimmed milk.

If fine gentlemen of publicized respectability, who show not their faces but who pull the strings, want the respect of the decent and honest men and women of America for their sincerity, they will start by trying a little economy where it will hurt their own pocketbooks. That, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, is too much to hope for, the power of long habit being what it is. I suppose when one has grown accustomed to believing that God intended him to have all the cream it is far preferable to take the chance on another depression rather than consent to a little of the cream dribbling into the other fellow's cup.

THE UNDISTURBING GOP SHADOW

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, now that Gabrielson has again blown his horn and a native son of the Hoosier Commonwealth has answered the clarion call to join Victor Johnson, executive secretary of the Republican senatorial campaign, to trail a great shadow over President Truman's train, we of the Democratic Party have not grown disturbed in the least. In fact, the opposition party has been trailing us since 1932 and it has a long trail ahead to convince the people of this Nation that it has something better to offer.

Recalling the great destructive shadow that the leaders of the Republican Party cast over our entire Nation in 1929, one would think the indelible lesson impressed upon their minds would stimulate them to refrain from the unscrupulous tactics of even attempting to shadow any type of an object.

However, realizing the fact that some people of the opposition had the audacity to paraphrase two of our most beautiful pieces of literature, the twenty-third psalm and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, in their desperation to discredit the Democratic Party, we must frankly ad-

mit some minds have grown barren of original ideas, and we can expect a bit of unthoughtful shadow casting as the trailers follow the Democratic leaders in quest of some constructive and durable platform planks to use that will appeal to the American people.

ORIGIN OF MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. HEDRICK. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday millions of people all over the Nation, as well as in other countries of the world, celebrated Mother's Day, and rightfully so. I think every day in the year should be Mother's Day, but I do agree that it is nice to have one day set aside on which we can really celebrate mother who has been termed "God's angel on earth."

I was astonished, though, in listening over the radio to several programs, that they apparently did not know where Mother's Day originated. One gentleman said it originated in Philadelphia at some church on such and such a street.

I wish to inform the House and the Nation that Mother's Day originated in Andrews Church at Grafton, W. Va., in 1907 where at the request of Miss Anna M. Jarvis, the first Mother's Day address was given by Mr. Norman F. Kendall, superintendent of the Sunday school, advocating the establishment of a day honoring all mothers everywhere. In 1908, on the anniversary of her mother's death, Miss Jarvis launched Mother's Day, now observed in every nation.

We feel that this honor should not be taken from us.

THE GLOVE INDUSTRY OF FULTON COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. KEARNEY. 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. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of last week, a delegation from Fulton County, N. Y., including the Honorable Robert B. Ramsey, mayor of the city of Gloversville, N. Y.; Mr. Walter Mahoney, representing the tanners association of the county; Mr. Gordon Blake; Mr. Nat Keene; Mr. Clarence M. Hallenbeck, vice president, Consolidated Cutters and Shavers Union; Mr. Leonard J. Eannig, president; and Bertha L. Beach, vice president and business manager; and Mr. James Casey, of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers; had a conference with Mr. Carl D. Corse, Chief of the Commercial Policy Staff, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State. They explained to him the serious situation that the glove industry of Fulton County, N. Y., is in as a result of lowered

tariffs and the uncertainty of a further reduction.

I was amazed and shocked by the attitude of this gentleman when he told the delegation they were "not interested in the 7,000 out of 9,000 American working men and women out of work," but they were "interested in the over-all picture."

We have a sick industry in Fulton County and unless something is done immediately it will be a dead industry and then it will be too late to revive the corpse.

How does the gentleman of the State Department reconcile his thoughts with the thoughts expressed by the President of the United States in his address at Fargo, N. Dak., when he said, according to the press, and I quote:

A gradual rise in imports over the next several years may, it is true, cause minor dislocations in our domestic economy, the same kind of dislocations that occur all the time in a dynamic economy, in which new products and new industries are constantly coming into the market. It will not cause more than that, because our system of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements is set up so as to give full consideration to the claims of every domestic industry that fears possible injury from increased imports.

Whom are we to believe, the Department of State or the President of the United States?

Along with many colleagues from other parts of the Nation, I feel that the time has come when joint action is necessary and that a united front be presented to the men having charge of the reciprocal trade agreements in order that we may know definitely what our Government is going to do for the various industries affected by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Reciprocity, in my humble opinion, is a two-way street, but the actions of those in charge and the administration firmly convince me that it is a one-way street and as a result thousands and thousands of American workers are out of jobs. The time for action is now.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CLOSING OF CERTAIN VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, warmest congratulations to the gentleman from West Virginia whose congressional district first observed Mother's Day. We all have the greatest love and affection for our mothers and for the memories of our mothers. We all remember our mothers' teachings and examples for consideration, kindness, and helpfulness to others. We remember the great love and patience they

showed us, their many fine examples of courage and fortitude. Our mothers want us to be fine men and women. Our mothers hope we may be successful in life but above all else they teach and exemplify the importance and enduring value of high moral character.

Mr. Speaker, many of the veterans' hospitals and hospitals for the servicemen in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are being closed. One of these that I think is especially close to the hearts of the mothers of America is the hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., if I can judge from the letters that come from there. This is a hospital where paraplegics are hospitalized. We passed a bill allowing them special houses. They have built their houses around that hospital in order that they could live at home, yet be near enough to that particular hospital in order to get treatment.

This is also true with reference to TB cases at that hospital. These cases will be transferred from a dry climate to a damp climate where the hospital is located. I remind the Members that it will be more expensive to operate this other hospital than to keep the boys at Van Nuys.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order, and I do it in order to stop the pressurizing. My point of order is that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 164]

Addonizio	Burton	Coudert
Allen, Calif.	Canfield	Crosser
Andresen,	Cannon	Cunningham
August H.	Carlyle	Dague
Angell	Carnahan	Davenport
Bailey	Carroll	Davies, N. Y.
Barden	Case, N. J.	Davis, Tenn.
Barrett, Pa.	Case, S. Dak.	Dawson
Biemiller	Cavalcante	Deane
Bolling	Celler	DeGraffenried
Boykin	Chatham	Delaney
Bramblett	Chesney	Dingell
Breen	Chipperfield	Dollinger
Bryson	Christopher	Dolliver
Buchanan	Chudoff	Donohue
Buckley, Ill.	Clemente	Douglas
Buckley, N. Y.	Cole, Kans.	Doyle
Bulwinkle	Cooley	Eaton
Burnside	Corbett	Eberharter

Ellsworth	Kirwan	Powell
Engel, Mich.	Klein	Quinn
Fenton	Kunkel	Rabaut
Fernandez	Lane	Redden
Fisher	Lanham	Rhodes
Flood	Latham	Ribicoff
Frazier	LeCompte	Rich
Fulton	Lesinski	Riehlman
Gamble	Lichtenwalter	Rivers
Gary	Linehan	Robeson, Jr.
Gavin	Lyle	Rodino
Gillette	McConnell	Rooney
Gilmer	McCulloch	Roosevelt
Gordon	McDonough	Sabath
Gorski	McGrath	Sadlak
Graham	McKinnon	Saylor
Granahan	McMillan, S. C.	Scott,
Green	McMillen, Ill.	Hardle
Gwinn	McSweeney	Scott,
Hale	Magee	Hugh D., Jr.
Hall,	Marcantonio	Shafer
Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa	Shelley
Halleck	Meyer	Sheppard
Hand	Miles	Simpson, Pa.
Hare	Miller, Calif.	Smathers
Hart	Miller, Md.	Smith, Ohio
Harvey	Mitchell	Smith, Va.
Havenner	Monroney	Stanley
Hays, Ohio	Morgan	Stockman
Heffernan	Morrison	Sutton
Heller	Morton	Taber
Herlong	Multer	Tauriello
Herter	Murphy	Taylor
Hoeven	Nixon	Towe
Hoffman, Ill.	Noland	Wadsworth
Hollfield	Norton	Walsh
Howell	O'Brien, Ill.	Walter
Jackson, Calif.	O'Hara, Minn.	Weichel
Jackson, Wash.	O'Neill	Welch
James	O'Toole	Wheeler
Javits	Passman	Whitaker
Jenison	Patten	White, Calif
Jones, N. C.	Patterson	Wickersham
Judd	Pfeifer,	Widnall
Kearns	Joseph L.	Wigglesworth
Kelley, Pa.	Pfeiffer,	Wolverton
Kelly, N. Y.	William L.	Wood
Keogh	Philbin	Woodhouse
Kerr	Phillips, Tenn.	Yates
Kilburn	Plumley	Young
King	Poulson	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and twenty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

A NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. LOVRE. 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 South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a farm bill known as a national agricultural policy to be carried out on a self-sustaining basis, and to promote conservation and development of the national soil resources.

This bill is the result of 32 grass-root conferences, with approximately 3,500 actual farmers and consumers participating which I conducted last year, and reflects the majority views of the farmers, consumers, and taxpayers alike.

It is self-financing and not dependent upon the Federal Treasury for its existence. It gets away from the fallacious Santa Claus philosophy. It provides for fair prices at the marketplace instead of doles and hand-outs.

It is operated and controlled from the grass-roots level, not from Washington bureaus.

It assures the farmer the maximum of freedom of activity, and is not infested with controls and penalties.

It operates within the framework of our free enterprise system, and is not socialistic in scope. It is discretionary with the farmer, and not mandatory.

It relieves the taxpayers of billions of dollars in taxes annually, thus relieving them of an undue hardship.

It provides for orderly disposal of farm surplus, so that the produce from God's ground is used to feed God's people, thus eliminating waste.

It will assist materially in balancing the budget, thus ending deficit spending.

It encourages better farming, rather than stifling the initiative of the individual farmer.

It protects the family sized farmer.

It stabilizes the farm income, thus preventing a decline in farm prices which would affect our entire economy.

Mr. Speaker, for a complete analysis of the farm problem and the bill which I have introduced today, I call your attention to the Appendix of the RECORD.

I do not say that the bill I have introduced is the only answer to the complex farm problem, but I do want to emphasize that it points the way and provides the pattern for a sound long-range farm program which is worthy of serious consideration. It is in that spirit I have introduced my bill.

ECA FUNDS REBUILDING FRENCH GAMBLING CASINO

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, listen—

NEWS RELEASE, PARIS, May 10.—Marshall plan funds are being used to the extent of 4,500,000 francs to rebuild the gambling casino at LaHavre, France. The ECA office here says, "This may seem a frivolous expenditure, but is important to help increase the town's revenue."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the taxpayers of this country will consider this not only frivolous but ridiculous. It is a reckless spending of the taxpayers money. The other body has appropriated \$150,000 to investigate gambling in this country and the ECA proposes to spend 4,500,000 francs to promote gambling in France. They are looking for a big tourist trade. These suckers will be given the proper trimming.

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that we stop spending the taxpayer's money to promote gambling in France.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice also they are going to use ECA funds to put in television throughout Italy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

PRESIDENT THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, some years ago the second President of the United States made a statement that may be of interest to the Members of the House at this time.

At that time he said:

JEFFERSON'S INTEGRITY

I confess that I am not reconciled to the idea of a chief magistrate parading himself through the several States, as an object of public gaze, and in quest of an applause which, to be valuable, should be purely voluntary. I had rather acquire silent good will by a faithful discharge of my duties than owe expressions of it to my putting myself in the way of receiving them.

As I have never yet seen the time when the public business would have permitted me to be so long in a situation in which I could not carry it on, so I have no reason to expect that such a time will come while I remain in office.

Mr. Speaker, those are the words of Thomas Jefferson.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ESTABLISHING GRADES OF CERTAIN RETIRED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1151) to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause over to and including line 3 on page 2 and insert "That the act entitled 'An act placing certain noncommissioned officers of the first grade', approved March 3, 1927, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 2. Noncommissioned officers of the following groups whose names were placed on the retired list of the Regular Army prior to July 1, 1922, are placed in the sixth enlisted pay grade established by section 201 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.)—

"(1) all sergeants (first class), other than those sergeants (first class) referred to in section 1, who were retired as such,

"(2) all sergeants (first class), other than those sergeants (first class) referred to in section 1, who were changed to staff sergeants pursuant to the act of June 4, 1920, and who continued as such staff sergeants, or who became technical sergeants prior to their retirement, and who were retired in the third pay grade established by subsection 4 (b) of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 761)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Mr. S. W. Jackson, of the highway department of the State of Pennsylvania, also a table contained in his annual report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

MAY 11, 1950.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: I wish to hereby tender my resignation as a member of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission.

With very best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. BARRETT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

SUSIE LEE SPENCER—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 593)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 1026, a bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer.

The enrolled bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay \$7,500 to the estate of Mrs. Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Mrs. Spencer sustained in an accident in the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, on December 11, 1943.

It appears from the committee reports and from Government records that Mrs. Spencer was employed by the Navy Department as a civilian truck driver at the Norfolk Navy Yard and was fatally injured on the night in question when her truck was struck by a train of cars which was being backed through the yard by a Navy yard locomotive. The investigating officer found that the railroad crossing had not been properly flagged in accordance with the Navy Department's general safety rules and that the conductor, a civilian employee of the Department, did not have his train under proper control

when approaching the crossing, and the officer expressed the opinion that the responsibility for the accident rested on the conductor who was charged with the proper handling of the train.

At the time of her death Mrs. Spencer was 28 years of age. She had been married only 8 months and left no dependent children or other relatives. Her husband made application under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for compensation on account of his wife's death. The claim had to be denied because there was no showing that, as required by the Compensation Act, the husband had been wholly dependent upon his wife for support at the time of her death. However, as permitted by the Compensation Act, a burial allowance of \$200 was awarded and paid to the funeral directors.

I can appreciate the motives of fairness and justice which prompted the Congress in seeking to make amends for the negligence of a Government employee by private bill insofar as money can do so. Unfortunately, I feel duty-bound to subordinate considerations of sympathy and individual equity to what I believe to be overriding considerations of sound public policy and equality before the law. The underlying issue presented by this case is identical to that involved in H. R. 1481, Eighty-first Congress, a bill for the relief of Julius Zaffareni, which, on May 3, 1950, I returned to the Congress without my approval. In view of this identity of issues, it would appear that the reasons upon which my disapproval of H. R. 1481 was based apply with equal force to the instant case.

Moreover, when consideration was recently being given to certain proposed amendments to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, which are now contained in Public Law 357, Eighty-first Congress, the question in what circumstances the surviving husband of a Federal employee killed in the performance of duty should be compensated was again before the Congress. In those amendments, the provision which limited the right of a surviving husband to compensation under the act to cases in which the husband was "wholly dependent for support upon the deceased employee at the time of her death" was not only reaffirmed but was clarified by providing that he should be entitled to compensation only if he was so dependent upon her "by reason of his physical or mental disability * * *." Such a recently established general policy should not be weakened by singling out a particular individual for special treatment which is manifestly not accorded to others similarly situated.

For the foregoing reasons, I am compelled to withhold my approval from this measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 1950.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

By unanimous consent, the bill and message were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BRYSON (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE) was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the National Tennessean.

Mr. MILES (at the request of Mr. FERNANDEZ) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a speech made by the President of the United States at Umatilla, Oreg.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson entitled "Security First, Economy Second."

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of the annual convention resolutions of the Kiwanis International.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in two to include editorials and in two to include resolutions.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject, How Safe Is America?

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in four instances and include newspaper reports.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the speeches made in the State of Idaho by the President of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include in the

first the speech of the President on May 11, in the second the speech of the President on May 12, and in the third the speech of the President on May 14.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Card Clothing Machine Operators Union of Fall River, Mass.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$430.50.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING CERTAIN BENEFITS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4295) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR SETTLEMENT IN ALASKA BY WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4424) to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4499) to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5920) to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the last time this bill was called up I asked unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I recognize the worthy objectives of the

bill and have discussed it with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. After further study of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the departments of Government that may take any bonds or make any payments within the purview of this law will be very, very careful to see that the rights and interests of the beneficiaries are protected at all times.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I know that last time the bill was called up the gentleman from Massachusetts had some questions concerning the protection which would be given to those who might be declared to be incompetent. Has the gentleman gone into this matter to find out if there are adequate safeguards in that regard?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the department or departments that make payments within the purview of this act and designate the appointment of what might be termed an informal guardian follow the matter closely and provide for yearly reports and see that only proper expenditures are made by the guardian or conservator or whatever such person may be called, and also keep a constant check on the matter, I believe that satisfactory controls will exist for the proper safeguarding of the rights of the incompetent.

Also, we must remember that on any payment in excess of \$1,000 a bond may be exacted, which is a further safeguard.

Of course, the departments should realize any person appointed by them is a trustee holding a serious position of trust. When we delegate that power to any agency or agencies, they in turn have the serious responsibility which constitutes a grave trust, and I believe we are justified in presuming that they will perform their duty accordingly if this bill becomes law. If not, then Congress can very quickly meet any abuses that may occur in the future.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of the author of the bill. I note that it refers to those who are mentally incompetent. There is also another bill, 499, dealing with the psychosis of veterans. I remind the author of the bill that about 800,000 people occupy hospitals for the insane in the United States, and about half the hospital beds in the United States are occupied by the mentally incompetent. Psychiatrists tell us that about 35 percent of those individuals are there, not because they are necessarily insane, but because they are trying to escape some of the difficulties of life. They use it as an escape mechanism to enter into another era of life in which they can be perfectly happy without all of the difficulties that come to people who are up against the hard realities of life. Now, who decides whether these people are mentally incompetent? Might there not be some of these people who find the realities of life so hard that they get into a mentally incompetent frame of

mind, where there might be some abuses connected with this legislation?

Mr. KILDAY. I am not familiar with the large group to which the gentleman refers. That appears to be a pretty hard way out of the hard realities of life. However, this applies to military personnel. That is, those who are paid under the military pay law and would not come under the group to which you refer. When these people become mentally incompetent they have a very small amount of money coming to them. Ordinarily it is a month or a few months' pay while they are being judged by a board, so that the amount rarely is over a thousand dollars. The bill calls for a board of doctors of medicine, one of whom shall be a psychiatrist.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think they are properly protected, but I am disturbed about the large number filling our hospitals for the insane, and the fact that probably 35 percent of those beds are filled with people who do go there to escape some of the tough realities of life.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to call attention to the fact that the bill was completely rewritten by the committee. It is not the bill which was before the House previously. It did not have the safeguards that this bill contains and it did not have the protection of a bond. We rewrote the bill completely.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might also say that I recognize the worthy objective sought. Of course, if a person goes into court and is bonded for a small amount, the legal expenses and the court expenses are very large in proportion to the amount paid. So I recognize the very worth-while objective, and, upon consideration, I am satisfied that we might well let this bill pass. If the agencies watch it closely in the interest of the unfortunate beneficiary over whom somebody has been appointed to take care of the money paid to them, then everything will be all right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the term "member of the uniformed services" as used in this act means any person on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, including transferred members of the Fleet Reserve and of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and members of the Reserve components of the respective services entitled to Federal pay either on the active or any retired list of said services.

Sec. 2. Any active duty pay and allowances, or any amounts due for accumulated or accrued leave, or any retired or retainer pay, otherwise payable to any member of the uniformed services who, in the opinion of competent medical authority, is mentally incapable of managing his own affairs, is authorized to be paid, for the use and benefit of such incompetent member, to such person or persons who may be designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce,

the Federal Security Administrator, or such other officer or officers as the respective Secretaries or Administrator may designate for such purposes, without the necessity for appointment in judicial proceedings of a committee, guardian, or other legal representative, and any payments to the person or persons so appointed as provided herein shall constitute a complete discharge of the obligation of the United States as to the amounts so paid: *Provided*, That no person serving in a legal, medical, or fiduciary capacity, or in any other capacity, shall demand or accept any fee, commission, or charge for any services rendered under the authority of, or in connection with, the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply where a legal committee, guardian, or other representative has been appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction, except as to any payments made hereunder prior to the receipt in the paying agency of the department or agency concerned of notice of such appointment.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Department concerned and the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out effectively the provisions of this act, and all determinations, except as to the amounts due, made by the respective Secretaries or by the Federal Security Administrator, or by their duly designated subordinates pursuant to this act, shall be final and conclusive and not subject to review by any court or Government official.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the term 'member of the uniformed services' as used in this act means any person on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, including transferred members of the Fleet Reserve and of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and members of the Reserve components of the respective services entitled to Federal pay either on the active or any retired list of said services.

"Sec. 2. Any active-duty pay and allowances, or any amounts due for accumulated or accrued leave, or any retired or retainer pay, otherwise payable to any member of the uniformed services who, in the opinion of competent medical authority, is mentally incapable of managing his own affairs, is authorized to be paid, for the use and benefit of such incompetent member, to such person or persons who may be designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Federal Security Administrator, or other such officer or officers as the respective Secretaries or Administrator may designate for such purposes, without the necessity for appointment in judicial proceedings of a committee, guardian, or other legal representatives, and any payments to the person or persons so appointed as provided herein shall constitute a complete discharge of the obligation of the United States as to the amounts so paid: *Provided*, That no person serving in a legal, medical, or fiduciary capacity, or in any other capacity, shall demand or accept any fee, commission, or charge for any services rendered under the authority of, or in connection with, the provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply where a legal committee, guardian, or other representative has been appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction, except as to any payments made hereunder prior to the receipt in the paying agency of the department or agency concerned of notice of such appointment: *And provided further*, That competent medical authority shall consist of a

board of not less than three qualified doctors of medicine, one of whom shall be specially qualified in the treatment of mental disorders, appointed by the Secretary of the Department concerned or the Federal Security Administrator from available medical officers.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Department concerned and the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out effectively the provisions of this act, including a requirement that such person or persons designated to receive payments as provided in section 2 above shall furnish satisfactory assurances that amounts received have been and will be applied to the use and benefits of the incompetent and, in cases wherein the payments may be reasonably expected to exceed \$1,000, that a suitable bond shall be provided by such person or persons which may be paid for out of sums due the incompetent.

"Sec. 4. The determination of the person or persons authorized to receive payments as provided in section 2 above, made by the respective Secretaries or by the Federal Security Administrator, or by their duly designated subordinates pursuant to this act, shall be final and conclusive and not subject to review by any court or Government official."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF ANNUAL LEAVE TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2350) to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 938), is amended by the addition of section 2, reading as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) If an officer or employee who under section 1 of this act would have been entitled to receive a lump-sum payment as compensation for annual leave is deceased, the payment shall be made to his estate.

"(b) The compensation provided for in section 1 of this Act shall be for all accumulated or current accrued annual leave which would have been due the officer or employee under the leave regulations in effect on the date of the expiration of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 72) had he remained in the service immediately following the expiration of the Bituminous Coal Act until the expiration of such annual leave and which has not been granted him or for which he has not otherwise received credit or compensation.

"(c) Notwithstanding the period provided in section 1 of this Act for the filing of notices of election to receive lump-sum payments as compensation for annual leave, such payments may be made if a notice of election has been or is filed by an officer or employee, or the duly authorized representative of the estate of an officer or employee who is deceased, before the expiration of 180 days after the enactment of this section 2.

"(d) Any payments heretofore made which are in conformity with the provisions of this act, as amended, are ratified.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$3,052.26 for the purpose of making payments under this Act, as amended."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3396) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the State of Kentucky, by quitclaim deed, title to that land, comprising approximately one hundred acres, acquired by the United States in the case entitled "United States of America versus Certain Lands Situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky., The West Point Brick Co., et al.", Civil No. 362, in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky at Louisville.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF OBSCENE MATTERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2811) to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **HUBER**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can somebody explain the provisions of this bill?

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think I might be able to explain the bill satisfactorily to the gentleman. It appears that at the present time, although the code does prohibit the importation or transportation of any obscene or lewd printed matter, books and so forth, it does not apply at the present time to phonograph records. This is to put phonograph records within the scope of the code in that regard, to put them in the same category as pictures and printed matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1462. Importation or Transportation of Obscene Matters.

"Whoever brings into the United States, or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or knowingly deposits with any express company or other common carrier, for carriage in interstate or foreign commerce—

"(a) any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, motion picture film, paper, letter, writing, print, or other matter of indecent character; or

"(b) any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy phonograph recording, electrical transcription, or other article or thing capable of producing sound; or

"(c) any drug, medicine, article, or thing designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception, or producing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral use; or any written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where, how, or of whom, or by what means any of such mentioned articles, matters, or things, may be obtained or made; or

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company or other common carrier any

matter or thing the depositing of which for carriage is herein made unlawful—

"Shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Sec. 2. The analysis of chapter 71 of such title, immediately preceding section 1461, is amended by striking out the item "1462. Importation or transportation of obscene literature," as set out in such analysis, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "1462. Importation or transportation of obscene matters."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out the word "things," and insert the word "things".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLITION OF HOLY CROSS NATIONAL MONUMENT, COLORADO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7339) to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Holy Cross National Monument, containing 1,392 acres, established by proclamation of May 11, 1929 (46 Stat. 2993), is hereby abolished, and the Federal lands and property therein shall hereafter be administered as a part of the national forest within which such properties are situated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANAGEMENT OF FOREST LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest land owners, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to cooperate with State foresters or equivalent officials of the several States, Territories, and possessions for the purpose of encouraging the States, Territories, and possessions to provide technical services to private forest landowners and operators, and processors of primary forest products with respect to the management of foreign lands and the harvesting, marketing, and processing of forest products, and, where necessary to avoid uneconomic duplication of certain technical and training services, to make such services available to private agencies and persons. All such technical services shall be provided in each State, Territory, or possession in accordance with a plan agreed upon in advance between the Secretary and the State forester or equivalent official of the State, Territory, or possession.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act, the sum of \$2,500,000. Apportionment among the participating States, administrative expenses in connection with cooperative action with such States, and the amount to

be expended by the Secretary to make technical services available to private persons and agencies, shall be determined by the Secretary after consultation with a national advisory board of not less than five State foresters or equivalent officials selected by a majority of the State foresters or equivalent officials of all States, Territories, or possessions participating in the program. The amount paid by the Federal Government to any State, Territory, or possession for cooperative action in the State, Territory, or possession shall not exceed during any fiscal year the amount expended by the cooperating State, Territory, or possession for the same purpose during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such expenditures on the certificate of the appropriate official of the State, Territory, or possession having charge of the cooperative work for the State, Territory, or possession that the expenditures as herein provided have been made: *Provided*, That it is the intent of Congress that the Secretary may continue to cooperate with persons and private agencies in furnishing technical forestry services under existing authority.

Sec. 3. The act of May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 188), known as the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, is hereby repealed effective June 30, 1950.

Sec. 4. This act shall be known as the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED MONTHLY DISABILITY BENEFITS UNDER NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6560) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize provisions in national service life-insurance policies for increased monthly disability benefits.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

UNIFORM BENEFITS FOR VETERANS ATTENDING MILITARY, NAVAL, AND COAST GUARD ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7739) to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of July 13, 1943 (Public Law 144, 78th Cong.; 38 U. S. C. 730), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. For the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy during the period from August 13, 1898, to July 5, 1902, shall be considered active military or naval service in the Spanish-American War; such service during the period from April 6, 1917, to November 12, 1918, shall be considered active military or naval service in World War I; and such service during the period December 7, 1941, to December 31, 1946, shall be considered active military or naval service in World War II."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "August 13" and insert in lieu thereof "April 21".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF DIVIDENDS ON NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE IN PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8236) to provide that on and after January 1, 1951, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the list of eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, would there be objection to taking up the next bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair allowed that to be done on one occasion and got into great trouble with the objectors; they had not studied it.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I will not ask that it be taken up.

AMENDING CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7058) to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to objection, will the gentleman from North Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 7058 is to amend certain laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy. This bill was originally presented to the committee as H. R. 5532; however, the committee found that the Army and the Navy purported to be accomplishing the same thing but in different sections of the bill. We were convinced that if it were desirable to authorize equal provisions in certain respects for the two Academies, it should be accomplished in a single unified section wherein the language would be equally applicable to both of the services. These amendments, together with other changes deemed desirable by the committee, resulted in the clean bill H. R. 7058.

Section 1 of the bill, with the exception of subsection (c), is a codification of the existing law relating to the source of appointments to the Military Academy at West Point. Inasmuch as it was necessary to amend the law with refer-

ence to the nomination of candidates from among enlisted members of the Army and the Air Force and the Reserve components, it was considered advisable to codify the other sections of law which have come into being as the result of successive legislative acts over a long period of years. Inasmuch as the Navy required no amendment to its existing law on this subject, no comparable section is included for the Navy.

Subsection (c) provides a new method for the selection of 180 cadets from enlisted members of the Army and the Air Force and their Reserve components. Under existing law, the Army has an allotment of 90 for the enlisted men of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force. The National Guard has an allotment of 90 for its enlisted members, including the enlisted members of the Air National Guard. However, enlisted members of the Active Reserve, other than the National Guard, are not permitted to compete for appointments to West Point. There are at present approximately 110,000 enlisted members in the Active Reserve, and it was considered appropriate to extend them the same incentive as is already enjoyed by the other enlisted persons hereinbefore mentioned. As a result, the committee has included a new subsection (c) which places the entire quota of 180 on a completely competitive basis. During any 4-year period, the Army, the Air Force, the National Guard, and the Enlisted Reserve will each be authorized to nominate three candidates for each available vacancy from among their enlisted members who have served in an active-duty or active-training status in such component for not less than 1 year, who will compete for admission at the annual competitive entrance examination. Therefore, during any given 4-year period, each of these sources will nominate not to exceed 540 enlisted men for the competition, from which group will be selected the 180 best qualified without regard to the service or component from which the candidates are appointed. The committee considers this to be more meritorious than existing provisions of law.

Section 2 revises the existing maximum and minimum ages for admission to the two Academies. Under existing law, enacted as a wartime measure, candidates for admission may be as much as 24 years of age. As a result, we are having 27- and 28-year-old ensigns and second lieutenants entering the service. This is not considered to be a desirable situation in peacetime. The original provisions of section 2 on page 4, line 22, provided a maximum age limit of 21 as of January 1 of the calendar year of which the candidate enters the Academy. General Collins, Army Chief of Staff, protested this age limitation on the basis that it was an undue restriction on many enlisted men in the Army who had less opportunity to be nominated to the Academy because of the restriction of the numbers which may be nominated from enlisted men of the Regular Army. He proposed that the maximum age be 22 on July 1 of the calendar year in which admitted. The committee agreed to this position and amended the bill. As a result, the minimum age for ad-

mission will be 17 years of age and the maximum will be 22 years of age as of July 1 of the year on which admitted.

Both the Navy and the Air Force strongly recommended the minimum age of 17. It is particularly important to the Air Force since those Academy graduates who are allotted to the Air Force must receive a period of flight training before being capable of performing their military duty. Therefore, it is desirable to obtain graduates at the youngest possible age.

The first proviso of section 2 is a codification so far as the Army is concerned and a substitution of a statutory provision for an administrative practice so far as the Navy is concerned. The Navy has followed this procedure for more than 50 years. The second proviso is merely a codification.

Section 3 is a codification of existing law which sets forth the undertakings in which cadets and midshipmen shall engage upon completion of their academic education at the Academies.

Section 4, with one exception, is a codification of existing Army law and is a new provision to the Navy. It has previously been required of the Army that when a new class of cadets contains less than the number authorized, the Secretary of the Army was permitted to enumerate sufficient additional candidates to fill the class. It was further provided that the two-thirds of those so appointed must be from among qualified alternate candidates nominated by the Vice President, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, Delegates and Resident Commissioners, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Governor of the Panama Canal, and one-third from among qualified candidates holding competitive appointments from sources authorized by law other than those holding such alternate appointments. The substitute amendments to existing law are found on page 7, line 3, in the words "at least two-thirds" and in lines 8 and 9 and in the words "not more than one-third." Under existing law, if the Army found that it was unable to fill its one-third quota, it applied these same restrictions to the two-thirds quota of qualified alternates of Congressmen and the other designated nominating agencies. The new language would remove this restriction so that if the Army is unable to attain its one-third quota, the deficiency may be supplied by appointing more than the two-thirds quota authorized for qualified alternates of the Vice President, Congressmen, and other designated agencies. The purpose of the amendment is to insure that the prescribed quotas of the respective academies will be maintained at full strength, the only limitation being the physical facilities of the respective Academies and the demands of the Armed Services.

The provisions of the original law, with reference to the two-thirds and one-third quotas, above described, were enacted as section 2 of the act of June 3, 1942, and were prompted for two reasons:

First. At the time of entrance of a new class each year, on July 1, there were usually more than 100 unfilled va-

cancies. Since the cost of operating the Military Academy, except for the modest pay of each cadet, is practically the same whether the corps is at full strength or under strength, it was apparent that it would be to the interest of the Government to make the maximum possible use of the plant and facilities at West Point.

Second. It was known that each year there were many congressional alternates with excellent qualifications who, though fully qualified mentally and physically, were denied entrance because their principals entered and there were no vacancies for the alternates. The same was true for many excellent competitive candidates for whom there were no vacancies. This provision, since its enactment, has been most gratifying and has resulted in the appointment of a number of congressional alternates who have proved to be outstanding cadets. I will not burden you with a complete list of the outstanding cadets who have been obtained from this source. I would call your attention to the committee report on pages 4 and 5 where eight of these young men, and a complete record of their outstanding accomplishments, are listed.

The foregoing facts clearly demonstrate the advisability of the original provisions of the 1942 act and the amendments contained in this bill. It should be thoroughly understood that neither these provisions nor other provisions of this bill will deprive any Congressman of a single nomination to either of the Academies. On the contrary, the only possible effect of section 4 will be to increase the number of congressional nominations.

The sole purpose of section 5 is to include the Air Force and Coast Guard personnel as sources from which the President may annually appoint 75 midshipmen.

Section 6, subsection (a), repeals existing law governing leave of absence of the Superintendent of the Military Academy without deduction from pay or allowances in the same manner as provided for other officers of the Academy. These provisions have been superseded by the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946. Therefore, this is a repealer section in the interest of codification.

Subsection (b) is a repealer section made necessary by section 2 of the bill. Subsections (c) and (d) are repealer sections, made necessary by the codification in sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the amendments to section 5.

No attempt is being made in this bill to codify all the existing law relating to the Academies. In all frankness, there are many variations in the law governing administration of the two Academies, however, the Services' Academy Board in the office of the Secretary of Defense is now giving full consideration to all of these discrepancies and it is anticipated that their recommendations will be embodied in appropriate legislation which will subsequently be submitted to the Congress.

The Department of Defense, with the concurrence of the respective military departments and the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, recommends the

enactment of the proposed legislation. The bill is reported to the House with the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Armed Services. The bill is not complicated, and its provisions are entirely meritorious. I hope that you will give it your speedy approval.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. About all the bill does is to increase the number of men who can be taken from the enlisted ranks, and it also allows the members of the Reserve component to compete.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. In order to build up our officer personnel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the corps of cadets of the United States Military Academy shall be authorized and consist of the following:

(a) Eight cadets from each State at large (four to be nominated by each Senator in Congress therefrom); four from each congressional district to be nominated by the Representative in Congress therefrom; four from each Territory to be nominated by the Delegate in Congress therefrom; four from Puerto Rico to be nominated by the Resident Commissioner thereof; six from the District of Columbia to be nominated by the Commissioners thereof, all of which cadets shall be actual residents of the State, or of the congressional or territorial district, or of the District of Columbia, or of the island of Puerto Rico, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed; and two cadets to be nominated by the Governor of the Panama Canal from among the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone and sons of civilian personnel of the United States Government and the Panama Railroad Company residing in the Republic of Panama.

(b) One hundred and seventy-two cadets from the United States at large, as follows: 40 to be nominated from among honor graduates of the honor military schools and the honor naval schools designated by the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy, respectively, such nominations to be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe; 40 from among the sons of members of the land or naval forces (including male and female members of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of all components thereof) of the United States, who were killed in action or have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated, in active service during World War I or World War II as each is defined by laws providing service-connected compensation or pension benefits for veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents: *Provided*, That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the service connection of the cause of death shall be binding upon the Secretary of the Army: *And provided further*, That such appointees are otherwise qualified and shall be selected in order of merit as established by competitive examination; 3 upon nomination of the Vice President; and 89 to be appointed upon the personal selection of the President.

(c) One hundred and eighty cadets from among enlisted members of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States. Each component (Regular and Reserve) of these services may nominate three candidates for each available vacancy from

among their enlisted members, who have served in an active-duty or active-training status in such component not less than 1 year, to compete for admission at the annual competitive entrance examination. Such nominations shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe. The vacancies will be filled from among such qualified competitors making the highest proficient averages in the order of merit established at the competitive entrance examination, without regard to the service or component thereof from which the candidates are appointed.

(d) The number of cadets hereinbefore authorized to be nominated or selected constitutes in each instance the total number of cadets authorized in the corps of cadets at any one time from the respective source or nomination or selection except as hereinafter provided in this act.

(e) In addition to the number of cadets hereinbefore authorized, which totals 2,496 there is also authorized such number of cadets (who are otherwise qualified for admission) as may be appointed from the United States at large from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded a Medal of Honor in the name of Congress for acts performed while in any of the Armed Forces of the United States.

All cadets, from whatever source of admission, shall be appointed by the President.

Sec. 2. Effective January 1, 1951, all candidates for admission to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy must be not less than 17 years of age on July 1 and not more than 21 years of age on January 1 of the calendar year in which they enter the Academy: *Provided*, That whenever any member of the graduating class shall fail to complete the course with his class by reason of sickness, or deficiency in his studies, or other cause, such failure shall not operate to delay the admission of his successor: *Provided further*, That candidates allowed for States, for congressional districts, for the District of Columbia, and for Territories for appointment to the respective Academies must be actual residents of the States, districts, or Territories, respectively, from which they are nominated.

Sec. 3. Hereafter, each cadet appointed to the United States Military Academy and each midshipman appointed to the United States Naval Academy shall, if a citizen or national of the United States, sign articles, with the consent of his parents or guardian if he be a minor, and if any he have, by which he shall engage—

(1) to complete the course of instruction at said Academy; and

(2) if tendered an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Regular Army or Regular Air Force upon graduation from the United States Military Academy, or in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps or Regular Air Force upon graduation from the United States Naval Academy, to accept such appointment and to serve under such appointment for not less than three consecutive years immediately following the date of graduation; and

(3) in the event of the acceptance of his resignation from a commissioned status in the Regular component of such armed service prior to the sixth anniversary of his graduation, or in the event of an appointment in such Regular service not being tendered, to accept a commission which may be tendered him in the Reserve component of such Regular service and not to resign from such Reserve component prior to such sixth anniversary.

Sec. 4. When upon determination that upon the admission of a new class to the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy, the total number of cadets or midshipmen will be less than the number authorized, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy

may within their discretion and within the capacity of the respective academies, nominate additional cadets or midshipmen, respectively, to be admitted in such class in such number to meet the needs of the armed services, but not to exceed the authorized strength of the corps of cadets or the brigade of midshipmen, from qualified candidates holding alternate appointments and other qualified candidates holding competitive appointments from the remaining sources of admission authorized by law recommended and found to be qualified by the Academic Board of the respective academies, at least two-thirds of those so appointed to be from among qualified alternate candidates nominated by the Vice President, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, Delegates and Resident Commissioners, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Governor of the Panama Canal, and not more than one-third of those so appointed to be from among qualified candidates holding competitive appointments from sources authorized by law other than those holding such alternate appointments: *Provided*, That any appointments made pursuant to this section shall be in addition to and not in lieu of appointments otherwise authorized by law.

Sec. 5. Subsection (a) of section 16 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1061), as amended (34 U. S. C. 1039), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President may appoint annually 75 midshipmen to the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard personnel."

Sec. 6. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(a) That part of the act of August 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 263, 264) reading as follows: "Hereafter the Secretary of War may grant the superintendent of the academy leave of absence without deduction from pay or allowances for the same period that the superintendent may grant leave of absence to other officers of the academy under the provisions of section 1330 of the Revised Statutes."

(b) Effective January 1, 1951, section 1318 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1 of the act of December 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 606), and section 1517 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 2 of the act of December 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 606).

(c) So much of—

(1) the second paragraph of the act of June 8, 1926 (ch. 492, 44 Stat. 704);

(2) the act of December 1, 1942 (ch. 650, 56 Stat. 1024);

(3) the act of November 24, 1945 (ch. 492, 59 Stat. 586); and

(4) the act of November 24, 1945 (ch. 493, 59 Stat. 586).

as pertain to cadets at the United States Military Academy, and the Secretary of War.

(d) Section 1321, Revised Statutes; section 2 of the act of May 4, 1916 (39 Stat. 62); chapter XXII of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 894); the act of June 7, 1935 (ch. 201, 49 Stat. 332); the act of July 26, 1937 (ch. 523, 50 Stat. 534); the act of June 3, 1942 (ch. 322, 56 Stat. 306); section 15 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1061), and all other laws or parts of laws inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and the provisions of this act shall be in effect in lieu thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, line 22, strike "on July 1" and substitute "twenty-two" for "twenty-one".

On page 4, line 23, substitute "July" for "January".

On page 5, line 15, after "engage", substitute a "comma" for the "dash" and add "unless sooner discharged by competent authority—".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the resolution (H. Res. 497) was laid on the table.

THE BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 567 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to 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. 5990) to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and at this time I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], who will explain to the House the provisions of the bill H. R. 5990.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 567 brings before the House the bill H. R. 5990 which is a measure I introduced some time back for the purpose of transferring jurisdiction from the Public Roads Administration to the National Park Service of certain rights-of-way and park land between the District of Columbia line and the Fort Meade Reservation.

At the close of the NRA President Roosevelt transferred from the then defunct NRA approximately \$2,000,000 to the Public Roads Administration for the purpose of developing a parkway system which would run primarily through vast Government reservations to connect with a similar road to be constructed from Baltimore to Fort Meade. An agreement was made at that time between the Federal Government and Maryland with reference to the location of the road. Had it not been for that agreement Maryland would naturally have programed the road at a width in keeping with the construction of Maryland roads rather than the 400 feet provided and at a location where it would have primarily served the public rather than the various Government reservations through which this will go.

As now located the parkway will extend along five Federal reservations, a distance of 8.5 miles of it being on Government land. Those reservations are Fort Meade with 13,000 or more acres, the District of Columbia Training School with 1,400 acres, the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge of 2,700 acres, the massive Beltsville Agricultural Experiment Station and Research Center of 12,000 acres, and the Greenbelt project of 3,000 acres, making a total of 33,260 Government-owned acres or about 52 square miles of Government land that this project goes through.

On the faith of this agreement the State of Maryland has practically completed its portion of the road which is approximately halfway from the city line down to Fort Meade.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman mean from the city of Baltimore?

Mr. SASSCER. From the city of Baltimore down to Fort Meade where the parkway system under this agreement is to pick it up and bring it on through those Government reservations, approximately half of it being through Government-owned land.

Rights-of-way have been obtained with this money that was allotted at the beginning, there has been some grading, all the engineering has been completed and it is located on a line which would not, of course, have been selected by the State.

No. 1 Highway, as all of you know, is a death trap. In 1949 38 people were killed and 739 injured, many of them seriously. We feel that this is a commitment, that it is primarily a Government project and in the faith of the commitment we urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. How much is this going to cost?

Mr. SASSCER. This bill limits the expenditure to \$13,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it going to result in an appropriation of \$13,000,000?

Mr. SASSCER. I understand \$3,000,000 has been approved by the budget. It is to be included in the parkway system.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to know what this is going to cost.

Mr. COX. Thirteen million dollars.

Mr. STEFAN. They will have to come in for an appropriation for that, will they not?

Mr. COX. I think so.

Mr. SASSCER. Part of the road will cost approximately \$15,000,000, and that is in the last stages of completion. Approximately \$2,000,000 of Federal money has been spent in the initial stages of this. The bill limits the expenditures to \$13,000,000. However, the immediate expenditure, which is a corollary but not in this bill, is \$3,000,000, which has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and will, we hope, be included in the parkway authorization.

Mr. STEFAN. Why could not that be taken out of the Federal State-aid road program instead of coming in here with special legislation?

Mr. BEALL. If the gentleman will yield, Maryland has already taken her share of the Federal contribution and put it on the eastern end of the road.

Mr. STEFAN. Then this is special legislation.

Mr. BEALL. No.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any objection on this side with regard to the passage of the rule. I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to follow the line of questioning started by the gentleman from Nebraska. As I understand, this is a move to get away from the regular Federal aid to highways system. Is that correct?

Mr. FALLON. To give the gentleman a brief history of this highway, the move to build this highway was initiated by the Federal Government back in 1942.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Can the gentleman answer my question directly? I have only a short time. I know the history of the act.

Mr. FALLON. The highway was designed by the Federal Government to serve Federal properties up to and including Fort Meade. The State of Maryland was asked if it would not cooperate and extend the highway from Fort Meade into Baltimore. This the State of Maryland agreed to do. This highway would serve 52 square miles of Government property, which is 10 square miles less than the whole city of Washington. The State of Maryland has already completed about 7 miles of highway and intends to complete the remaining 6 miles into Fort Meade by the end of 1952. The Government has acquired all the rights-of-way from Fort Meade into the city of Washington, on which it has spent approximately \$2,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Now answer this question. Exactly how much money is coming out of the Treasury of the United States as the result of this authorization, if it is agreed to?

Mr. FALLON. Thirteen million dollars.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is not this plan called the \$35,000,000 parkway?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Where do we get this money? How much is entailed here?

Mr. FALLON. Maryland is putting up \$14,000,000—some to build its end of the highway.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Why could you not come in here when we bring the regular Federal-State-aid highway bill into the House and take care of this project then? We are going to have that bill here in a few days.

Mr. FALLON. Under the new general highway bill Maryland can build a road from the point where they have now stopped into the District of Columbia, but not using the same route, not serving the Government property but serving the Maryland constituency, for the same amount of money as the Government is going to put into this highway, under the new general roads bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Does not the gentleman believe that this is maybe special legislation?

Mr. FALLON. No; this is not special legislation at all.

Mr. STEFAN. It is special legislation in that it does not come in under the regular Federal-aid highway program.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The proposed parkway is in a different category than the ordinary Federal highway, because it serves much Federal Government property.

Mr. FALLON. Fifty-two square miles of Government property.

Mr. SHORT. Maryland is putting up her share.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. This is some difference and some variation of the usual procedure as established in the 1940 and 1944 Highway Acts. This bill and also the highway has been considered by our Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, and we felt this was a separate program and should be considered by itself. The total cost will be \$13,000,000, but it represents a different principle of allocation than carried in the Highway Act which will be considered by this body Friday of this week.

Mr. STEFAN. Do you not believe in view of the fact that \$13,000,000 is involved, it ought to be held over?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I feel that it should be considered today so we will then be ready to hear the Highway Act on Friday.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Do you not think in view of the importance of this procedure, apparent new precedent, taking this program away from Mr. MacDonald's Public Road department and putting it into the Department of the Interior, this ought to be passed over? It calls for an eventual appropriation of \$13,000,000. This is very important legislation.

Mr. FALLON. I do not believe the matter should be passed over now, because if the State of Maryland was to build this highway from the point where they have now stopped, into the District of Columbia under the regular Federal aid to roads program, they would not use this route, and they would not be serving 52 square miles of Government property. Instead, the road would serve more of State property and the \$2,000,000 that the Government has already put up would be wasted, because the State of Maryland is not going to build a road through Government property.

Mr. STEFAN. I am afraid we are hurrying this unnecessarily. I know a safe highway is needed but I just wonder if we are setting a new precedent.

Mr. FALLON. May I point out to the gentlemen that this project is 9 years old.

Mr. STEFAN. I know of the hard work the gentleman from Maryland [Mr.

BEALL] has done on this legislation in order to eventually get this road in Maryland completed but I feel the matter should have full and lengthy debate in view of the money involved and the apparent precedent the legislation sets.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the huge outlay of funds involved in this bill, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 165]

Addonizio	Gillette	Morrison
Allen, Calif.	Gilmer	Morton
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Multer
Andresen.	Gorski	Murphy
August H.	Graham	Nixon
Andrews	Granahan	Norton
Angell	Grant	O'Brien, Ill.
Arends	Green	O'Hara, Minn.
Barden	Gwinn	O'Neill
Barrett, Pa.	Hale	O'Toole
Biemiller	Hall	Pace
Bolling	Leonard W.	Passman
Boykin	Halleck	Patterson
Bramblett	Hand	Pfeifer,
Breen	Hare	Joseph L.
Bryson	Hart	Pfeiffer,
Buchanan	Harvey	William L.
Buckley, Ill.	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Buckley, N. Y.	Heffernan	Phillips, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Heller	Plumley
Burdick	Herlong	Poulson
Burnside	Herter	Powell
Burton	Hoeven	Quinn
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Rabaut
Cannon	Hollifield	Ramsay
Carlyle	Howell	Redden
Carnahan	Jackson, Calif.	Rhodes
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	Ribicoff
Case, N. J.	James	Rich
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Riehman
Cavalcante	Jenison	Rivers
Celler	Jennings	Robeson
Chatham	Jones, N. C.	Rodino
Chesney	Judd	Roosevelt
Chipfield	Kearns	Sabath
Christopher	Kelley, Pa.	Sadiak
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Clemente	Keogh	Scott,
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Hardie
Corbett	Kirwan	Scott,
Coudert	Klein	Hugh D., Jr.
Cunningham	Kunkel	Shafer
Dague	Lane	Shelley
Davenport	Lanham	Sheppard
Davis, N. Y.	Latham	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	Lesinski	Stanley
Deane	Lichtenwalter	Stockman
DeGraffenreid	Linehan	Sutton
Delaney	Lovre	Taber
Dingell	Lyle	Taylor
Dollinger	McConnell	Towe
Dolliver	McCulloch	Wadsworth
Donohue	McDonough	Walsh
Doughton	McGrath	Walter
Douglas	McKinnon	Weichel
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	Welch
Eaton	McMillen, Ill.	Wheeler
Eberharter	McSweeney	Whitaker
Elsworth	Magee	White, Calif.
Engel, Mich.	Marcantonio	White, Idaho
Engle, Calif.	Martin, Iowa	Wickersham
Feighan	Meyer	Widnall
Fenton	Miles	Wigglesworth
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Woodverton
Frazier	Miller, Md.	Wood
Fulton	Miller, Nebr.	Woodhouse
Gamble	Mitchell	Yates
Gary	Monroney	Young
Gavin	Morgan	Zablocki

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 228 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I trust my remarks will not be construed in any way as a criticism directly or indirectly of any Member who has made a point of order that a quorum is not present. But in justice to the Members who are necessarily absent today, as majority leader I feel it is my duty to make clear for the RECORD that some Members are away today because of the primary which will take place tomorrow in the State of Pennsylvania. It is a time-honored custom, regardless of the party in power, to take into consideration the primary contests in the several States in making up the legislative program. The leadership of the House, whether it has been Democratic or Republican, has always scheduled a light program on the day of any primary, as well as the day before and, if possible, the day after, so that Members might have the opportunity to attend to their primary contests, if any, and to vote themselves. Of course, every Member wants to set an example for the people of his district by being home and voting.

As majority leader of the House, I take the responsibility involved in so scheduling the legislative program of the House. I do not hesitate to do so because it has been done for years during the time that I have been majority leader, and also when my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], was majority leader during the Eightieth Congress, as I feel properly so.

For today we had the Consent Calendar scheduled and the bill and rule which is now being considered. Tomorrow we will have the Private Calendar and one bill. These matters would have to be taken up some time and so we are not wasting time today by taking up this legislation. If they are not taken up today and tomorrow, they will have to be taken up later in the week. These bills scheduled for today and tomorrow are more or less noncontroversial, the controversial legislation being scheduled for the latter part of the week.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I heartily concur in what the majority leader has just said. any other modus operandi would be intolerable. It would not be possible to carry on the business of the House. Recently a certain columnist arraigned Members on both sides for alleged absenteeism. Ordinarily, a Member of the House is working in his office when the bells ring and he finds out a quorum call is taking place. Ninety percent of the Member's time is spent in his office or making calls on the various departments of Government or at committee meetings. That is the way a Member of Congress serves the people of his district. I express my appreciation to the majority leader for what he has just said.

Mr. McCORMACK. I felt it was my duty and obligation on this occasion to make that clear to the membership. I am in no way criticising, directly or indirectly, any Member who makes a point of order that a quorum is not present. But, I feel it is my duty to protect the Members who are away, so that the RECORD would reflect the true picture, so the people of the country may be advised through the press what the situation actually is. Those Members who are away today should not be criticized because of their absence in order to attend to matters concerning themselves and their constituencies.

Furthermore, the legislation which we are now considering is more or less noncontroversial. It would, of course, have to be programmed at some time and it should be understood by all that we are by no means wasting time by taking this legislation up now, but on the other hand, we are extending the proper sort of consideration to our colleagues who may have a primary fight on their hands, the sort of consideration that all of us would like to receive if we had a primary fight.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any time on the rule, but I feel I might be able to clear up a few misunderstandings in regard to this bill.

I would like to start from the beginning. The move to build this highway was initiated by the Federal Government in 1942. Two million dollars was appropriated to the Public Roads Administration to build the highway. The purpose of building the highway was a national defense measure. It was initiated by President Roosevelt to serve mainly Fort Meade. At the time this move was initiated the officials of the State of Maryland were called in and asked if they would cooperate with the Federal Government, that when the highway is completed to Fort Meade they would continue the highway on to Baltimore. The officials of Maryland agreed to do this. They agreed to build it under Federal specifications, that is, with a 400-foot right-of-way acquired by the State of Maryland, from Fort Meade into Baltimore, to conform with the rights-of-way acquired by the Federal Government from Washington to Fort Meade. They also specified that there should be dual 24-foot lanes divided not less than 100 feet, according to the topography of the land. The construction of this road is considerably more than the average State expends on a normal dual State highway, due to the width of the highway and the width of the rights-of-way. It is not normal that a State condemn property 400 feet wide for any particular highway.

The Federal Government proceeded to secure rights-of-way from the District line up to a point below Jessup's Road, opposite Fort Meade. The private property that was acquired, and also the Federal Government agencies in agreement, turned this road over to the Public Works Administration. Something less than \$2,000,000 was spent in acquir-

ing and grading 6 miles of this highway, starting at the District line 3 miles, and starting from Fort Meade toward Washington 3 miles. Of course, the war came on and the work was suspended, due to material reasons. But after the war was over, the State of Maryland, living up to the agreement it made with the Federal Government, has already constructed the highway, according to Government specifications, down to a point below what is known as Friendship Airport. The State of Maryland has acquired rights-of-way in and across Jessup's Road, where they will build a large underpass so that this will be a safe non-access highway.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not a fact that Maryland has just about completed her part of it now? It has completed about 8 miles and has about 5 miles to complete?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct. It has completed 8 miles and has about 5 miles to complete. The State roads commission tell us now in the committee that they would have it completed in 1952.

Mr. BEALL. And is it not further a fact that this road as built will not be of any use to anybody until it is built all the way in?

Mr. FALLON. It would not be of any use to the Federal Government as far as serving this property is concerned. This road serves 52 square miles of Federal property. That is only 10 square miles less than the whole city of Washington. When this highway is built through this Government property it will enhance the value of this property to the extent that it might pay the Government to build this road for nothing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Aside from the explanation that the gentleman is making, the question has been asked as to why this proposal was not embraced in the general Federal-aid highway bill which is to be considered later in the week. Is it not true that this proposal for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway were embraced in one bill introduced in 1949?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And that at the request of the Committee on Public Works, those two proposals were divorced on the ground that there should be separate treatment of each proposal, and thereupon Suitland was taken over under an act passed by the Congress in 1949, and this bill was reported in a separate bill which was introduced in August 1949, following the passage of the Suitland highway bill.

Mr. FALLON. That is true.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And is it not also true that one reason why this bill was reported separately was because the President recommended in his budget an appropriation? The committee

thought there should be an authorization before the President's recommendation was adopted by the Congress, although strictly not necessary, but to limit the appropriations. Thereupon, this bill was submitted presently, submitted unanimously by the committee because of the fact that its construction had already begun and because of the further fact that it was unlike all other authorizations for parkway construction where work had not been begun. We are faced with a separate proposition which should be considered, and I believe that a consideration of this bill on its merits will show that there is no conflict between this bill and the regular Federal Aid Authorization Act.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. It should be pointed out that the highway passes through five different Federal reservations and properties in about half of the distance between here and Fort Meade.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman from Michigan is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What concerns me is whether or not this is going to prove to be a precedent for the enlargement of all these other highways running out of Washington, whether they be in Maryland or Virginia. Will it be the future policy of the Government to construct four-lane highways on Route 29 to the northeast, or Route 240 to the west?

Mr. FALLON. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota should have been asked and that it is a matter that gave a number of us some concern. The gentleman from Maryland says he does not think it will set a precedent, but the fact remains that the Federal Government has constructed and paid for the construction of about one-third of the road from here to Fort Belvoir; the fact remains that the Federal Government has paid for the construction and building of the highways that go into Virginia and around the Pentagon; the fact remains that the Federal Government paid for the construction of the Mount Vernon Boulevard; the fact remains that the Federal Government pays for the construction of all parkways within the national parks and the District of Columbia; all parkways in the District are constructed by the Federal Government.

Mr. DONDERO. The question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] was exactly the question I raised in the committee. We discussed other projects and features, but were advised that no precedent was set.

Mr. FALLON. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that if he will remember, at that time I said that this is quite a different category because the Federal Government is coming in and

asking the State to do a thing; it is not a case of the State coming to the Federal Government and asking the Federal Government for something.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is there involved in this plan any arrangement to bypass Baltimore, or will we still have to spend an hour trying to get through Baltimore?

Mr. FALLON. That too came out in the committee, and I will explain that to the gentleman. Baltimore City has an appropriation now under a law passed last year to spend \$20,000,000 on the first leg of a highway bypassing Baltimore. In addition to that, an announcement was made by the Governor 2 weeks ago that when the Chesapeake bridge is completed, which will be 2 years from now, it is their intention to take this highway across and under the Patapsco River into the Philadelphia road as in the Federal plan, and is planning to bypass Baltimore City. In addition to that, we have one leg of the bypass completed.

Mr. VORYS. What the gentleman has to say about Baltimore and Maryland is most persuasive with me in asking the Federal Government to participate.

Mr. FALLON. And I may also say that a new highway is being built now from Annapolis into Washington, a new dual highway, in which the Federal Government will not be asked to contribute one single cent.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to compliment my friend the gentleman from Maryland on the able presentation he is making; I intend to support him on the pending rule.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In passing this type of legislation is a precedent set for other States and cities to ask for like aid?

Mr. FALLON. No precedent is set.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman cite similar instances in which these provisions prevail?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] just went into great detail on the different parkways in and around Washington which the Federal Government has constructed literally at its own cost. However, the Federal Government is not paying the entire bill because in this case with a cost of \$30,000,000, the State of Maryland is paying \$15,000,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. All these highways, though, were constructed by the military.

Mr. FALLON. Under the Highway Act, Maryland can get a 50 percent Federal contribution on such a highway, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, being the first Member today to raise the point of order that a quorum was not present, I want to say that I was first provoked to do that by a slight misunderstanding as to a ruling of the Chair. However, in view of the fact that legislation of such importance, involving a large sum of money, smelling decidedly like pork, is being called up, I do not think it should be considered in a campaign year without a quorum being present to decide on the merits of such legislation. I think we should have a quorum on the floor before legislation involving so many millions of dollars is considered. In all fairness to the taxpayers who are going to dole out the millions for this highway to Pimlico and Laurel, to the race tracks, and to reelect perhaps or assist in reelecting people to high office in the State of Maryland, in view of the fact that the taxpayers are already financing a junket for High Tax H., who is now traveling across the country, I think it is highly improper that this legislation be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I can go along with the statement that business must be scheduled for consideration and that we all desire that everyone who has a primary should have full opportunity of attending and advising with his people. But when there is important legislation or legislation calling for the expenditure of \$15,000,000, and when the gentleman who scheduled this legislation knows that many Members of the House will be away, not only for attendance at their primary campaign and to conduct their primary campaigns, but, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] said, when 145 of them are attending a political meeting in Chicago, at which President Truman is making a nonpolitical speech then important legislation calling for the expenditure of this amount of money should be postponed so that the membership of the House may be present and vote. I am sure the gentlemen in Chicago who are enjoying this Democratic celebration would like to be here and assist in seeing that the money is appropriated for proper purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] referred to this road being built to the race tracks for gambling purposes. They are spending 4,500,000 francs to build a gambling casino over there in France with ECA funds.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I heard the gentleman speak about that this morning. I assume it does not meet with his approval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I take it that the gentleman from Kansas is the one to whom the majority leader referred a moment ago as raising the point of order that a quorum was not present. I raised that point of order and properly so because in the Second District of Kansas \$15,000,000 is important business. When we have a piece of legislation authorizing the expenditure of that sum of money I felt, and I still feel, that a quorum should be present for the consideration of the rule bringing up a measure authorizing the spending of that much money. In the weeks just passed we members of the Appropriations Committee were toiling here day in and day out trying to save money for the taxpayers. Now we see a piece of legislation brought in here which would authorize more money after an hour's deliberation than we were able to save in a week's time. I was absolutely right when I made the point of order that a quorum was not present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 166]		
Addonizio	Davis, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Dawson	Hollifield
Anderson, Calif.	Deane	Howell
Andresen,	DeGraffenried	Huber
August H.	Delaney	Jackson, Calif.
Angell	Dingell	Jackson, Wash.
Barden	Dollinger	James
Barrett, Pa.	Dolliver	Javits
Battle	Donohue	Jenison
Biemiller	Douglas	Jennings
Bolling	Doyle	Jones, N. C.
Bolton, Ohio	Eaton	Judd
Boykin	Eberharter	Kearns
Bramblett	Ellsworth	Kelley, Pa.
Breen	Engel, Mich.	Kelly, N. Y.
Bryson	Feighan	Keogh
Buchanan	Fenton	Kerr
Buckley, Ill.	Fernandez	Kilburn
Buckley, N. Y.	Flood	Kirwan
Bulwinkle	Frazier	Klein
Burke	Fulton	Kunkel
Burnside	Gamble	Lane
Burton	Gary	Lanham
Byrne, N. Y.	Gavin, Pa.	Latham
Canfield	Gillette	LeCompte
Carlyle	Gilmer	Lesinski
Carnahan	Gordon	Lichtenwalter
Carroll	Gorski	Lind
Case, N. J.	Graham	Linehan
Case, S. Dak.	Granahan	Lovre
Cavalcante	Green	Lyle
Celler	Gwinn	McCarthy
Chatham	Hale	McConnell
Chesney	Hall,	McCulloch
Chipherfield	Leonard W.	McDonough
Christopher	Halleck	McGrath
Chudoff	Hand	McKinnon
Clemente	Hare	McMillan, S. C.
Cole, Kans.	Hart	McMillen, Ill.
Corbett	Harvey	McSweeney
Coudert	Hays, Ohio	Magee
Crosser	Hébert	Marcantonio
Cunningham	Heffernan	Martin, Iowa
Dague	Heller	Meyer
Davenport	Herlong	Miles
Davis, N. Y.	Hertner	Miller, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Hoeven	Miller, Md.

Mitchell	Quinn	Stockman
Monroney	Rabaut	Sutton
Morgan	Ramsay	Taber
Morrison	Redden	Taylor
Morton	Rhodes	Towe
Multer	Ribicoff	Wadsworth
Murphy	Rich	Walsh
Nixon	Riehlman	Walter
Norton	Rivers	Weichel
O'Brien, Ill.	Robeson	Welch
O'Hara, Minn.	Rodino	Wheeler
O'Neill	Roosevelt	Whitaker
O'Toole	Sabath	White, Calif.
Passman	Sadlak	White, Idaho
Patterson	Saylor	Wickersham
Pfeifer,	Scott, Hardie	Widnall
Joseph L.	Scott,	Wigglesworth
Pfeiffer,	Hugh D., Jr.	Wolverton
William L.	Shafer	Wood
Philbin	Shelley	Woodhouse
Phillips, Tenn.	Sheppard	Yates
Plumley	Simpson, Pa.	Young
Potter	Smith, Ohio	Zablocki
Poulson	Stanley	
Powell	Steed	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and twenty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic. 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 194, nays 32, not voting 206, as follows:

[Roll No. 167] YEAS—194

Abbt	Doughton	Jonas
Abernethy	Durham	Jones, Ala.
Albert	Elliott	Jones, Mo.
Allen, Ill.	Elston	Karst
Allen, La.	Evins	Karsten
Anderson, Calif.	Fallon	Kee
Andrews	Fellows	Kennedy
Arends	Fernandez	Kerr
Aspinall	Fogarty	Kilday
Auchincloss	Forand	King
Balley	Ford	Kruse
Baring	Fugate	Larcade
Bates, Ky.	Furcolo	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Garmatz	Lenke
Beall	Gathings	Lodge
Beckworth	Golden	Lucas
Bennett, Fla.	Goodwin	Lynch
Bennett, Mich.	Gore	McCarthy
Bishop	Gossett	McCormack
Blackney	Granger	McGregor
Blatnik	Grant	McGuire
Boggs, Del.	Gregory	McSweeney
Boggs, La.	Guill	Mack, Ill.
Bolton, Md.	Hagen	Mack, Wash.
Bonner	Hall,	Madden
Bosone	Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Brehm	Harden	Mansfield
Brooks	Hardy	Marsalis
Brown, Ga.	Harris	Martin, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Harrison	Mason
Burdick	Harvey	Morrow
Burke	Havener	Mills
Burleson	Hays, Ark.	Morris
Camp	Hedrick	Moulder
Cannon	Heseltun	Murdock
Chief	Hill	Murray, Tenn.
Colmer	Hinshaw	Nicholson
Combs	Hobbs	Noland
Cooley	Holmes	Norrell
Cooper	Hope	O'Brien, Mich.
Cox	Horan	O'Hara, Ill.
Crawford	Huber	O'Sullivan
Crosser	Irving	Patman
Davis, Ga.	Jacobs	Patten
Denton	Jenkins	Perkins
D'Ewart	Jensen	Peterson
Dondero	Johnson	

Pickett	Secrest	Tollefson
Poage	Short	Trimble
Polk	Sikes	Underwood
Preston	Simpson, Ill.	Van Zandt
Price	Sims	Velde
Priest	Smith, Va.	Vinson
Rains	Spence	Vorys
Rankin	Staggers	Vursell
Reed, Ill.	Steed	Wagner
Richards	Stigler	Wardell
Rogers, Fla.	Sullivan	Whittington
Rogers, Mass.	Tackett	Wier
Rooney	Talle	Williams
Sadowski	Tauriello	Willis
St. George	Teague	Wilson, Okla.
Sanborn	Thomas	Wilson, Tex.
Sasser	Thompson	Wolcott
Scudder	Thornberry	Woodruff

NAYS—32

Andersen,	Hull	Phillips, Calif.
H. Carl	Kean	Reed, N. Y.
Barrett, Wyo.	Kearney	Rees
Byrnes, Wis.	Keating	Scrivner
Clevenger	Keefe	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Cotton	Marshall	Stefan
Curtis	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Davis, Wis.	Murray, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Gross	Norblad	Winstead
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Konski	Withrow

NOT VOTING—206

Addonizio	Gilmer	Murphy
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Nixon
Andresen,	Gorski	Norton
August H.	Graham	O'Brien, Ill.
Angell	Granahan	O'Hara, Minn.
Barden	Green	O'Neill
Barrett, Pa.	Gwinn	O'Toole
Battle	Hale	Pace
Bentsen	Hall,	Passman
Biemiller	Leonard W.	Patterson
Bolling	Halleck	Pfeifer,
Bolton, Ohio	Hand	Joseph L.
Boykin	Hare	Pfeiffer,
Bramblett	Hart	William L.
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Bryson	Hébert	Phillips, Tenn.
Buchanan	Heffernan	Plumley
Buckley, Ill.	Heller	Potter
Buckley, N. Y.	Herlong	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Herter	Powell
Burnside	Hoeven	Quinn
Burton	Hoffman, Ill.	Rabaut
Byrne, N. Y.	Hollifield	Ramsay
Canfield	Howell	Redden
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Regan
Carnahan	Jackson, Wash.	Rhodes
Carroll	James	Ribicoff
Case, N. J.	Javits	Rich
Case, S. Dak.	Jenison	Riehlman
Cavalcante	Jennings	Rivers
Celler	Jones, N. C.	Robeson, Jr.
Chatham	Judd	Rodino
Chesney	Kearns	Roosevelt
Chipherfield	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Christopher	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadlak
Chudoff	Keogh	Saylor
Clemente	Kilburn	Scott, Hardie
Cole, Kans.	Kirwan	Scott,
Corbett	Klein	Hugh D., Jr.
Coudert	Kunkel	Shafer
Crook	Lane	Shelley
Cunningham	Lanham	Sheppard
Dague	Latham	Simpson, Pa.
Davenport	LeCompte	Smathers
Davis, N. Y.	Lesinski	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Stanley
Dawson	Lind	Stockman
Deane	Linehan	Sutton
DeGraffenried	Lovre	Taber
Delaney	Lyle	Taylor
Dingell	McConnell	Towe
Dollinger	McCulloch	Wadsworth
Dolliver	McDonough	Walsh
Donohue	McGrath	Walter
Douglas	McKinnon	Weichel
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	Weich
Eaton	McMillen, Ill.	Wheeler
Eberharter	Magee	Whitaker
Ellsworth	Marcantonio	White, Calif.
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Iowa	White, Idaho
Engle, Calif.	Meyer	Wickersham
Feighan	Michener	Widnall
Fenton	Miles	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wolverton
Flood	Miller, Md.	Wood
Frazier	Mitchell	Woodhouse
Fulton	Monroney	Yates
Gamble	Morgan	Young
Gavin	Morrison	Zablocki
Gillette	Morton	
	Multer	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

- Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wolverton.
- Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Towe.
- Mr. Breen with Mr. Canfield.
- Mr. Murphy with Mr. Eaton.
- Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Case of New Jersey.
- Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Weichel.
- Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. Rodino with Mr. Gavin.
- Mr. Clemente with Mr. Graham.
- Mr. Heller with Mr. Judd.
- Mr. Delaney with Mr. Taber.
- Mr. Quinn with Mr. Taylor.
- Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Wigglesworth.
- Mr. Klein with Mr. Wadsworth.
- Mr. Davenport with Mr. Hardie Scott.
- Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
- Mr. Green with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
- Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Coudert.
- Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dague.
- Mr. Hefferna. with Mr. Bolton of Ohio.
- Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Allen of California.
- Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Latham.
- Mr. Doyle with Mr. Chipferfield.
- Mr. Morgan with Mr. Hand.
- Mr. Welch with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
- Mr. Morrison with Mr. Jackson of California.
- Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. James.
- Mr. Multer with Mr. Jenison.
- Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Stockman.
- Mr. McGrath with Mr. Gwinn.
- Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
- Mr. White of California with Mr. Halleck.
- Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Fulton.
- Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Gamble.
- Mr. Bolling with Mr. Ellsworth.
- Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Corbett.
- Mr. Hare with Mr. Patterson.
- Mr. Battle with Mr. Poulson.
- Mr. Granahan with Mr. Shafer.
- Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Kearns.
- Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Rich.
- Mr. Stanley with Mr. Sadlak.
- Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
- Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
- Mr. Yates with Mr. McCulloch.
- Mr. Zablocki with Mr. McDonough.
- Mr. Gordon with Mr. Lovre.
- Mr. de Graffenried with Mr. Angell.
- Mr. Feighan with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
- Mr. Magee with Mr. Kilburn.
- Mr. Frazier with Mr. Meyer.
- Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Kunkel.
- Mr. Young with Mr. Michener.
- Mr. Redden with Mr. Nixon.
- Mr. Philbin with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
- Mr. Donohue with Mr. Potter.
- Mr. Deane with Mr. Plumley.
- Mr. Chesney with Mr. Riehlman.
- Mr. Buckley of Illinois with Mr. Widnall.
- Mr. O'Neill with Mr. August H. Andresen.
- Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Bramblett.
- Mr. Boykin with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
- Mr. Linehan with Mr. Cunningham.
- Mr. M'tchell with Mr. Dolliver.
- Mr. Sutton with Mr. Hale.
- Mr. Gary with Mr. Herter.
- Mr. Gorski with Mr. Hoeven.
- Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jennings.
- Mr. Hart with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
- Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
- Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
- Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. REED of New York changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

THE BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. WHITTINGTON. 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. 5990) to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON of Indiana) there were—ayes 119, noes 14.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic. 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 192, nays 29, not voting 211, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

YEAS—192

- Abbutt
- Abernethy
- Albert
- Allen, Ill.
- Allen, La.
- Anderson, Calif.
- Andrews
- Aspinall
- Auchincloss
- Bailey
- Baring
- Barrett, Wyo.
- Bates, Ky.
- Bates, Mass.
- Battle
- Beall
- Beckworth
- Bennett, Fla.
- Bennett, Mich.
- Bentsen
- Bishop
- Blackney
- Blatnik
- Boggs, Del.
- Bolton, Md.
- Bonner
- Bosone
- Brehm
- Brooks
- Brown, Ga.
- Brown, Ohio
- Burdick
- Burleson
- Camp
- Cannon
- Chelf
- Christopher
- Cole, N. Y.
- Colmer
- Combs
- Cooley
- Cooper
- Cox
- Crawford
- Crook
- Davis, Ga.
- Denton
- D'Ewart
- Dondero
- Doughton
- Durham
- Elliott
- Elston
- Evins
- Fallon
- Fellows
- Fernandez
- Fogarty
- Forand
- Ford
- Fugate
- Furcolo
- Garmatz
- Gathings
- Golden
- Goodwin
- Gore
- Gossett
- Granger
- Grant
- Gregory
- Gull
- Hagen
- Hall
- Harden
- Hardy
- Harrison
- Havennner
- Hays, Ark.
- Hedrick
- Heselton
- Hill
- Hinshaw
- Hobbs
- Holmes
- Hope
- Horan
- Huber
- Irving
- Jacobs
- Jenkins
- Jensen
- Johnson
- Jonas
- Jones, Ala.
- Jones, Mo.
- Karst
- Karsten
- Kennedy
- Kerr
- Kilday
- King
- Kruse
- Larcade
- Lefevre
- Lemke
- Lodge
- Lucas
- Lynch
- McCarthy
- McCormack
- McGregor
- McGuire
- McSweeney
- Mack, Ill.
- Mack, Wash.
- Madden
- Mahon
- Mansfield
- Marsalis
- Marshall
- Martin, Mass.
- Mason
- Merrrow
- Michener
- Mills
- Morris
- Moulder
- Murdock
- Murray, Tenn.
- Nelson
- Nicholson
- Noland
- Norrell
- O'Brien, Mich.
- O'Hara, Ill.
- O'Sullivan
- Patman
- Patten
- Perkins
- Peterson
- Pickett
- Poage
- Polk
- Preston
- Price
- Priest
- Rains
- Rankin
- Reed, Ill.
- Rogers, Fla.
- Rogers, Mass.
- Rooney
- Sadowski
- St. George
- Sanborn
- Sasser
- Scudder
- Secrest
- Short
- Sikes
- Simpson, Ill.
- Sims
- Smith, Va.

- Spence
- Staggers
- Steed
- Sullivan
- Tackett
- Talle
- Tauriello
- Teague
- Thompson
- Thornberry

- Tollefson
- Trimble
- Underwood
- Van Zandt
- Vinson
- Vorys
- Vursell
- Wagner
- White, Idaho
- Whitten

- Whittington
- Wier
- Willis
- Wilson, Okla.
- Wilson, Tex.
- Winstead
- Wolcott
- Woodruff

NAYS—29

- Andersen, H. Carl
- Byrnes, Wis.
- Clevenger
- Cotton
- Curtis
- Davis, Wis.
- Gross
- Hoffman, Mich.
- Hull

- Kean
- Kearney
- Keating
- Keefe
- Macy
- Miller, Nebr.
- Murray, Wis.
- Norblad
- O'Konski
- Reed, N. Y.

- Rees
- Scrivner
- Smith, Kans.
- Smith, Wis.
- Stefan
- Velde
- Werdel
- Williams
- Wilson, Ind.
- Withrow

NOT VOTING—211

- Addonizio
- Allen, Calif.
- Andresen, August H.
- Angell
- Arends
- Earden
- Barrett, Pa.
- Biemiller
- Boggs, La.
- Bolling
- Bolton, Ohio
- Boykin
- Bramblett
- Ereen
- Bryson
- Buchanan
- Buckley, Ill.
- Buckley, N. Y.
- Bulwinkle
- Burke
- Burnside
- Burton
- Byrne, N. Y.
- Canfield
- Carnahan
- Carroll
- Case, N. J.
- Case, S. Dak.
- Cavalcante
- Celler
- Chatham
- Chesney
- Chipperfield
- Chudoff
- Clemente
- Cole, Kans.
- Corbett
- Coudert
- Crosser
- Cunningham
- Dague
- Davenport
- Davies, N. Y.
- Davis, Tenn.
- Dawson
- Deane
- DeGraffenried
- Delaney
- Dingell
- Dollinger
- Dolliver
- Donohue
- Douglas
- Doyle
- Eaton
- Eberharter
- Ellsworth
- Engel, Mich.
- Engle, Calif.
- Feighan
- Fenton
- Fisher
- Flood
- Frazier
- Fulton
- Gamble
- Gary
- Gavin
- Gillette
- Gilmer

- Gordon
- Gorski
- Graham
- Granahan
- Green
- Gwinn
- Hale
- Hall, Leonard W.
- Halleck
- Hand
- Hare
- Harris
- Hart
- Harvey
- Hays, Ohio
- Hébert
- Heffernan
- Heller
- Herlong
- Herter
- Hoeven
- Hoffman, Ill.
- Hollifield
- Howell
- Jackson, Calif.
- Jackson, Wash.
- James
- Javits
- Jenison
- Jennings
- Jones, N. C.
- Judd
- Kearns
- Kee
- Kelley, Pa.
- Kelley, N. Y.
- Keogh
- Kilburn
- Kirwan
- Klein
- Kunkel
- Lane
- Lanham
- Latham
- LeCompte
- Lesinski
- Lichtenwalter
- Lind
- Linehan
- Lovre
- Lytle
- McConnell
- McCulloch
- McDonough
- McGrath
- McKinnon
- McMillan, S. C.
- McMillan, Ill.
- Magee
- Marcantonio
- Martin, Iowa
- Meyer
- Miles
- Miller, Calif.
- Miller, Md.
- Mitchell
- Monroney
- Morgan
- Morrison
- Morton
- Multer

- Murphy
- Nixon
- Norton
- O'Brien, Ill.
- O'Hara, Minn.
- O'Neill
- O'Toole
- Pace
- Passman
- Patterson
- Pfeifer, Joseph L.
- Pfeifer, William L.
- Philbin
- Phillips, Calif.
- Phillips, Tenn.
- Plumley
- Potter
- Poulson
- Powell
- Quinn
- Rabaut
- Ramsay
- Redden
- Regan
- Rhodes
- Ribicoff
- Rich
- Richards
- Riehlman
- Rivers
- Robeson
- Rodino
- Roosevelt
- Sabath
- Sadlak
- Saylor
- Scott, Hardie
- Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
- Shafer
- Shelley
- Sheppard
- Simpson, Pa.
- Smathers
- Smith, Ohio
- Stanley
- Stigler
- Stockman
- Sutton
- Taber
- Taylor
- Thomas
- Towe
- Wadsworth
- Walsh
- Walter
- Weichel
- Welch
- Wheeler
- Whitaker
- White, Calif.
- Wickersham
- Widnall
- Wigglesworth
- Wolverton
- Wood
- Woodhouse
- Yates
- Young
- Zablocki

So the motion was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

- Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fulton.
- Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Case of New Jersey.
 Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Chipperfield.
 Mr. Burnside with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wolverton.
 Mr. Howell with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Judd.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kearns.
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Jackson of California.
 Mr. Lind with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
 Mr. Lyle with Mr. James.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Dolliver.
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. Allen of California.
 Mr. McKinnon with Mr. August H. Andersen.
 Mr. Monroney with Mr. Corbett.
 Mr. Redden with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gavin.
 Mr. Stigler with Mr. Gillette.
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Gwinn.
 Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Kunkel.
 Mr. Heller with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Magee with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Welch with Mr. Hand.
 Mr. Chesney with Mr. Herter.
 Mr. Buckley of Illinois with Mr. Wigglesworth.
 Mr. Burke with Mr. Welchel.
 Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Towe.
 Mr. Feighan with Mr. Riehlman.
 Mr. Gary with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Dague.
 Mr. Frazier with Mr. Graham.
 Mr. Gordon with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
 Mr. Linehan with Mr. Hoeven.
 Mr. Zablocki with Mr. LeCompte.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Angell.
 Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Walsh with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
 Mr. Rhodes with Mr. McDonough.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Meyer.
 Mr. Hare with Mr. Coudert.
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
 Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Phillips of California.
 Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Taber.
 Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Hardie Scott.
 Mr. Breen with Mr. Potter.
 Mr. Stanley with Mr. Poulson.
 Mr. Bolling with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
 Mr. Lane with Mr. Nixon.
 Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Paterson.
 Mr. Green with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
 Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Shafer.
 Mr. Granahan with Mr. Stockman.
 Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Jennings.
 Mr. Davenport with Mr. Jenison.
 Mr. Deane with Mr. Hale.
 Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Latham.
 Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Bramblett.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Lovre.
 Mr. Doyle with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
 Mr. Rodino with Mr. Morton.
 Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
 Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Sadiak.
 Mr. Hollfield with Mr. Cunningham.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
 Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from "present" to "aye."
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The doors were opened.

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. 5990, with Mr. HUBER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, known as the Baltimore-Washington Parkway bill, is an authorization bill. It was carefully considered by the Committee on Public Works for two sessions of the Congress, and has been unanimously reported to the House.

I judge from the remarks thus far made that some Members of the House feel that this project should be authorized in the general Federal Aid Act of 1950. In that they are mistaken. When the House considers it, that bill will provide for authorizations for parkways that have already been authorized, and limit the amounts of the authorizations.

For instance, the authorizations for roads in Indian lands were made by a separate act, dated May 26, 1928. The authorizations made for roads in the national parks and for national monuments were made by a separate act April 9, 1924. The authorization for the Blue Ridge Parkway was made by a separate act of August 14, 1947.

In the Eighty-first Congress, first session, a bill was introduced to provide for the Federal Government's taking over and completing the Suitland Parkway and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. The House Committee on Public Works reported favorably on the Suitland Parkway because it had been completed. They amended the bill so as to eliminate the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. The Suitland Parkway bill was passed by the Congress.

I say that the first ground of opposition today, that this bill should have been considered as a part of the Federal aid highway authorization bill, later this week falls to the ground because previous parkway authorizations, and I have named at least one of them, have been considered by special acts, as is being done in the pending bill.

It may surprise those who have thus far manifested opposition on the so-called ground of economy when I say that the pending authorization bill will promote economy and in all probability reduce authorizations rather than increase them for the completion of this project. I make that statement for this reason: This parkway was authorized by a directive of the President of the United States on September 9, 1942, and the President allocated \$2,000,000 for its construction from unobligated National Industrial Recovery Act funds to the Public Roads Administration. Under the rules of the House this is a public work that is under construction and, if appropriations were made without any further authorization a point of order could not be made against those appropriations.

This bill under consideration limits the amount of appropriations that can be made to \$13,000,000. Without this au-

thorization bill there would be no limit on the appropriations.

There are other restrictions and limitations in the pending bill that would promote economy and that would prevent other appropriations that might be made. I refer among other things to the matter of rights-of-way. The bill provides for rights-of-way through Greenbelt and other Government reservations to be turned over to the Department of Interior without costs.

This bill was not loosely reported by the Committee on Public Works. The committee went into every phase of it. I make the statement that this bill is in line with the policy under the Federal aid highway authorization bill already reported to the House and to be considered as scheduled later this week.

Moreover the leadership, and they need no defense at my hands, has kept faith with the House. Last Thursday the acting majority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], in response to a question by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], stated this bill would be up for consideration today.

As to the merits of the bill, permit me to say one of the most congested highways in the United States is between Washington and Baltimore. The most traveled highway in the world is between Philadelphia and New York City, and the road from Philadelphia to Washington is but a continuation. You may perhaps insist, and I will agree with you, that the most important road in the world is the one that goes by your front door. Last year, 1949, seven to eight hundred people were injured on the Baltimore-Washington Boulevard. There is just one highway between Washington and Baltimore. Two of the greatest railroad systems in the United States, the Baltimore & Ohio and the Pennsylvania, are required to carry the traffic from Washington to Baltimore and then on to New York. The existing Washington-Baltimore Boulevard is so congested that it cannot be widened or enlarged. This bill, which has had the consideration of the Committee on Public Works in the Eightieth Congress, under the chairmanship of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and has been reported and which is now before you, would in the opinion of the committee promote economy because the rights-of-way have already been acquired and paid for to the amount of about \$440,000, and because the bill provides for rights-of-way without costs through Government reservations.

Under the terms of this bill the other rights-of-way, as a result of the amendments to the bill, are to be contributed to the Federal Government, either by the State of Maryland or from existing Federal reservations. We have put every safeguard around the bill. There are two main railroads, as I have said, between Washington and Baltimore. There is only one highway which it is most expensive to enlarge or widen. Those who have studied the problem of highways in this country know that there is one thing which is absolutely apparent, and that

is the need for more four-lane highways. We need more four-lane highways between congested centers of population. I have been a student of this question for a good many years. This is in reality a national-defense road. This road was started in 1942, and if this is not a national-defense road from here to Fort Meade and the other Federal reservations, it would be difficult to point one out. It was essential when it was started, during the war, and now is greatly needed.

Under the Federal aid to highways bill, which we are recommending to you, we are saying when the Federal Government collects \$1,500,000,000 in taxes from the auto users of this country and we are only authorizing \$500,000,000 annually, there should be an increase in the Federal contribution to these main defense and interregional thoroughfares.

For 18.8 miles from Washington to Fort Meade the rights-of-way have already been acquired. Keep in mind that the rights-of-way for defense highways in many cases cost a great deal more than the construction of the highway itself. The rights-of-way do not have to be paid for. The grading has already been done 4 miles from the District line toward Fort Meade, with 3 miles from Fort Meade toward Washington. The parkway is to be supplemented by a four-lane highway by the State of Maryland which is under construction now from Baltimore to Fort Meade at a cost of \$14,000,000. Maryland is using Federal funds to match State funds. The Federal Government puts up \$7,000,000 of that and the State of Maryland \$7,000,000. I say this bill would promote economy under the rules of the House because under the rules of the House there would be no limitation on the amount that could be appropriated. We have put a limitation of \$13,000,000 here, while we know that they might spend more than that without that limitation; \$13,000,000 plus \$14,000,000 expended by Maryland makes a total of \$27,000,000.

Under the Federal Aid to Highways bill for defense or interregional highways it is contemplated the Federal Government would pay three-fourths, or 75 percent, whether the road goes through Jackson, or Vicksburg, as it does in Mississippi or the road east and west through those two cities goes, or whether it is on the interregional or defense system in any other State. So in the circumstances it does strike me that this separate bill reported some thirty days before we reported the Federal-aid-to-highways bill merits your favorable consideration, especially since the President of the United States has requested an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for the next fiscal year. It was unanimously reported by our committee. I personally feel the bill should be considered before we bring in the Highway Act of 1950 so as to put a limitation on it before there was an appropriation for the current year to provide for additional necessary highway needs between Washington and Baltimore. The bill was carefully considered and unanimously reported and I respectfully submit the bill should be

unanimously passed by the House because it is absolutely in line with the appropriations which we authorized and the legislation that has been proposed and heretofore supported so far as the construction of highways in our national defense of interregional system is concerned.

Mr. HINSHAW. One of the basic principles of major highway construction in these times is that the major highway shall bypass heavily congested areas, or that the through travel will be able to bypass those areas.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I anticipate the gentleman's question. I have said that the only highway between Washington and Baltimore, 1,100 miles from where I live and the district I represent, cannot be widened. It is a four-lane highway. It is proposed to go about 3 or 4 miles from that road, but not in a territory that is so populous, and put this main thoroughfare through at a total cost of \$13,000,000. If you undertake to widen the present thoroughfare to make it an eight-lane highway, I hesitate to hazard a guess as to what the cost might be, but it would be many times the cost of the present bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will this highway join onto route 40 bypassing Baltimore?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Nobody is any more anxious than I am to bypass Baltimore, or every other city where there is a bottleneck. You have heard the statement of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] with respect to the cost of undertaking to bypass Baltimore, and they are undertaking to do that work. They have issued bonds, as I understand it, for that purpose. Personally, I would like to see them bypass Baltimore. Moreover, the matter of bypassing large cities is not a matter altogether of not going through those cities. In cities like Cleveland, and other large cities, it is often a matter of acquiring at less cost so-called slum areas. But, bypass or not, whether you go around or go through, this type of highway or parkway construction is essential if you do any bypassing, within or without the cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to take further time to yield to any member of the committee who desires to ask questions.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. What percentage of the land will be Government-owned land in the District of Columbia, and what percentage will be in private or State land?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fair question, and I will again state that all of the privately owned land in the stretch of about 3 miles from the District line has already been acquired under money that President Roosevelt set aside in 1942. That in the District of Columbia, and from about 3 miles from where the construction now starts on Defense

Road, this bill provides that Greenbelt and other reservations shall transfer the title of the land so that there is no expense for rights-of-way whatsoever. All rights-of-way of private lands have been acquired. All other rights-of-way are through Government-owned lands and the transfer of these lands is provided for in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. You are going to build approximately 19 miles of highway?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. Seven miles of the grading has already been done. The cost will be approximately \$15,000,000. The cost will be a total of \$15,000,000, or \$13,000,000 as authorized.

Mr. GROSS. How much is that per mile?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That will average about \$680,000 a mile against about \$450,000 a mile for the Pennsylvania Turnpike, although costs of construction have increased at least 200 percent since the Pennsylvania Turnpike was constructed. Just a few days ago we had testimony that in congested centers in the State of New Jersey it is costing, in some areas, as much as \$5,000,000 per mile to construct a throughway and some parts of a parkway are costing more than \$1,000,000 per mile. The cost of the proposed parkway to the Federal Government will be less than the cost to the Federal Government if the present four-lane highway were to be increased to an eight-lane highway. The proposed bill is the most practical provision for increased highway facilities with Federal aid from Washington to Baltimore.

Mr. GROSS. But will the distinguished gentleman not agree with me that you are not building this through a congested area on the Government end of it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree that while the Baltimore-Washington Parkway is not being built through as congested an area as along the existing Baltimore Boulevard, it nevertheless will serve a great many people with proper accesses who are on Government reservations. Sixty-five hundred employees do not live on the reservation at Fort Meade. Beltsville has 2,500 employees but only about 40 families live on the grounds. Greenbelt has a population of 7,000 who would use the Parkway. The Greenbelt and the Beltsville reservation center are to transfer rights-of-way. The proposed parkway does pass through a rugged country. The grading will be expensive. The accesses will be expensive. There will be one crossing over the Pennsylvania Railroad. There will be some 13 other installations that are expensive. The committee believes that the estimated cost of \$13,000,000 is fair and reasonable. It is far less than the total cost now being paid for the 90-mile extension that is being made to the Pennsylvania Turnpike. That extension is costing, as I am advised, about a million dollars a mile. Moreover, some 15 years ago, without the right-of-way, as I recall, the 160 miles of the Pennsylvania Turnpike cost \$70,000,000 or about

\$450,000 a mile. The proposed parkway will be in keeping with the other parkways in the District of Columbia. It will be comparable to the Suitland Parkway. It will provide for reaching military and other Government installations with protection to the public. It will certainly more than double the present capacity of the Baltimore Boulevard.

The cost of highway construction has increased in 15 years. Many miles in parkways being constructed today in other jurisdictions cost over \$1,000,000 a mile.

The proposed parkway will not only be used by Washington and by Baltimore and by the Government reservations, but it will be used by the people of the United States who travel between Washington and Baltimore where additional highway facilities are probably more greatly needed than in any other part of the United States.

Finally, on account of Fort Meade, Beltsville, and other Federal reservations, there will not be precedent for the construction of parkways where there are no military establishments or Government reservations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody in this House who knows anything about my record over the last 18 years will accuse me of being a spender. I have been far the other way. The record will show that I voted against all foreign spending except where it provided clothes and food for women and children abroad, immediately after the end of World War II.

We are considering a bill here today for a good road. Good roads in our modern day are as essential as the automobiles which travel them. Perhaps this bill may not present exactly the same road program as passes through your district. We are presented with a condition different from the ordinary road program. A condition which satisfied my opposition to this bill at first. I am not only in favor of it, but our committee unanimously reported this bill to the House. We have 18.8 miles of roadway, a large portion of which traverses through land owned by the Federal Government; five Federal reservations would be served by this road. Part of the road is already constructed or graded. The State of Maryland is now constructing its portion. At the end of the Federal portion of this highway is a military installation, Fort Meade. Some people object to this bill because the Federal Government will pay more than 50 percent of the cost, as we do throughout the Nation where we have the State-Federal highway program. We have precedent for this project in the Fort Belvoir and Mount Vernon highways, maintained by the Federal Government.

The Baltimore Pike, or U. S. No. 1, which now exists undoubtedly is one of the most congested highways in the United States. As the Chairman already has pointed out, 32,000 vehicles used that road every day last year. Thirty-eight people were killed. There

were 748 accidents reported, and the Maryland State police say there are at least twice that number of accidents not reported. The total damage to property alone was \$3,500,000. More than 700 people were injured, 513 seriously. I give these figures to show the congested and dangerous condition on one of the main roads leading out of the District of Columbia where the heart of the Federal Government is situated—the highway between Washington and the city of Baltimore.

What are you going to do? What is your solution if you oppose this bill, which your committee brings to the House today? Certainly, as the chairman has pointed out, to try to widen the present road between here and Baltimore and make it an eight-lane highway, would cost far more to acquire the right-of-way, than the total amount necessary to build this new highway. The right-of-way for this new highway is already acquired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. You are spending no money for the acquisition of the right-of-way; is that so?

Mr. DONDERO. We are spending no money for the acquisition of the right-of-way; that is already acquired.

Mr. GROSS. And yet you are spending approximately \$15,000,000 for the building of 19 miles of road. Where else in the country is there any such cost in the construction of a road?

Mr. DONDERO. You have a right-of-way 400 feet wide; it is to be a double-lane highway, that is a four-lane highway with a small parkway in the center. Highway construction in congested areas costs a great deal more.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know what the comparison in cost would be between this proposed highway and the Pennsylvania Turnpike?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know; I have never inquired into the cost of the turnpike, but I know the turnpike is paying for itself and is far ahead of schedule.

Mr. GROSS. It is a toll road.

Will the Federal Government police this new road?

Mr. DONDERO. I expect it will, at least a portion of it.

Mr. GROSS. And maintain it? Who is going to control the concessions? Will there be any oil stations and other concessions?

Mr. DONDERO. The Federal Government controls the property on both sides, so I expect it will control whatever is placed on Federal property.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] will yield, permit me to say that as I recall the Pennsylvania Turnpike, without the costs of rights-of-way, was about \$450,000 per mile. An addition of 90 miles is being made today and it is costing about \$1,000,000 a mile. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway is through rugged country. The grade is expensive. A number of bridges are to be constructed. More than 13 separate crossings have got to be constructed. Again, the cost of construction since the

Pennsylvania Turnpike was built has increased from 126 to 200 percent. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway like the Pennsylvania Turnpike will provide for proper location for concessions and accesses to protect the public. Moreover, is it not true that the Federal Government made a grant of 45 percent to the construction of the Pennsylvania Turnpike?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct; it was an out-and-out grant to the State of Pennsylvania of \$45,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Permit me to say that under the Defense Highway Act, during the war, the Government paid 75 percent of the costs of Federal-aid roads to defense plants and installations. Let me also say that in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, which is scheduled for hearing this week, the Federal Government will pay 75 percent of the costs of Federal-aid highways that are on the interregional system, primarily in national defense.

Let me also say that in the pending bill the Federal Government will pay about 75 percent of the total costs of the parkway and the road from Fort Meade to Baltimore.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa who has just interrogated me that I raised the question in the committee about establishing a precedent believing that we were doing something here that we were not doing in other parts of the United States; but in both that Mount Vernon highway and Fort Belvoir highway military installations are involved. Military installations are involved in this road. At Fort Meade we have 10,000 military and civilian residents and 6,500 employees who do not live on the reservation but who enter and leave daily. Therefore the installation alone involves some 16,000 people. In case of war or an emergency this highway would certainly be considered a part of our national defense to expedite easy and quick passage between Washington, Fort Meade, and Baltimore.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have listened attentively, and there are some questions that are unanswered, in my opinion. The first one is, Why was this special authorization necessary in view of the fact that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] stated, as I understood him, that this project had been started under some Executive order under which the President had transferred some funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Where did the \$2,000,000 come from that the President transferred?

Mr. DONDERO. It came from an unexpended fund. I cannot advise the gentleman exactly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It was from some unobligated National Industrial Recovery Act funds that the President was authorized to allocate to highway and parkway construction.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That gives the source. As I understood the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] he inferred, if he did not make the out-and-out statement, that even without this legislation under that Executive order this road could be built.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I did not say exactly that. It could be built but there would not be the limitations as to costs and rights-of-way contained in the pending bill. I said under that directive the road had been begun and under the rules of the House Federal works projects once started are not subject to a point of order against making an appropriation to complete them. That was my statement.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is substantially the same thing. You can go ahead without this special authorization.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, but there would be no limitations such as we have in this bill. They might go out and acquire additional rights-of-way, they might not limit the cost to \$13,000,000; they could spend more than the \$13,000,000. In the bill, therefore, there is a limitation on the cost. It costs \$1,000,000 to build some miles of road in national parks. The costs of building concrete roads has vastly increased and the increase, as I recall, from 1941 to 1949 in building the average highway is 126 percent. Roads that used to cost \$30,000 a mile are today costing, as I am advised in many cases, \$100,000 a mile. The cost of highway construction, like all other construction, is vastly more than it was when the Pennsylvania Turnpike was authorized, or than it was 15 years ago.

The State of Maryland is one of the most economy-minded States in the country and it is building 12 miles and spending \$14,000,000. I respectfully submit that if the Federal Government only spends \$13,000,000 and puts in a parkway 800 feet or more wide, it will be doing a more economical job than is done by the State of Maryland, from Fort Meade to Baltimore.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman from Mississippi does not assume they will go out and get more highway. We have been told that all of the highway has been acquired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It has been so far as this bill is concerned, but without this bill there would be no limitation on their getting other rights-of-way if it developed they needed them. A parkway in New Jersey is being constructed today and in many cases the cost is in excess of \$1,000,000 a mile.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I assume they are going to be economical, that there would be no further right-of-way acquired when they already have it. Now, another question and going one step further. I still think from what the gentleman from Mississippi said that under his statement this road has been started under Executive order; as he said, it is not a new project, and it could carry on. There is a limitation but that would be for the Appropriations Committee. One of the gentlemen from Maryland mentioned the fact, as I understood him, and I have tried to hear everything, that it really did not make much difference be-

cause by this act and under this program we are authorizing 50 percent of the construction and under the general program they would be in the same position, is that right?

Mr. DONDERO. The Federal Government would pay the cost from Washington to Fort Meade, and Maryland would pay one-half from Fort Meade to Baltimore.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Under the general road-building legislation there would be a 50 percent contribution from the Federal Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; from Fort Meade to Baltimore. I could not conceive the State of Maryland wanting to build a roadway over Government property. Government property extends nearly half of the way between Washington and Fort Meade.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The Federal Government has not raised any objection to that.

Mr. DONDERO. No; I cannot imagine the State of Maryland building a road with State funds over Federal property.

Mr. SCRIVNER. You come in here with special legislation when we have general legislation. As I understand it, you are coming in here on Thursday or Friday with a road bill that will cover the entire United States. Why should one stretch of road from Baltimore to Washington have separate action as compared with any other road in the United States?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what some may contend, this legislation is highly irregular. It is brought in, I would say, in a very convenient way and time. Here we have 221 Members on the floor of the House, according to the last recorded vote, only three more than half. We are considering a bill which provides for the building of a fairway or parkway or high-speed thoroughfare for the convenience of those wishing to get out of Washington to Pimlico and Laurel in a hurry and to get back. In another body we are studying legislation to outlaw gambling.

This bill states "To provide for the development, administration, and maintenance"—maintenance, if you please—"of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland."

My good friend from Michigan makes comparison between this project and the Federal highway leading to Mount Vernon. Since when do you compare the city of Baltimore with Mount Vernon? Since when did the city of Baltimore become a national shrine or a memorial of some type? There is no correlation between them whatsoever. We all know that Mount Vernon is the estate of the Father of his country. The highway leads there and ends there.

This bill is for a Federal highway through Government property to Baltimore and it is brought up at this time when there is barely a quorum present.

The leadership of the House on both the Republican and Democratic sides should go slow in committing Members without their knowledge or consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made allegations, yet he is not even decent enough to yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I was sent here by my district, a good, conservative district in the State of Indiana, to speak for them and for no one else. No one except my constituents are dictating to me or speaking for me. I expect to represent them as I see fit to do so.

Yes; this highway will be maintained by civil-service employees, broken-down politicians. You people who get up and speak for economy but vote for every issue to pledge the Federal Government to a greater outlay of money seem to be a little inconsistent. Yes; and you speak about the number of people on the Federal payroll, but what are you doing today, with a bare 221 Members present? You are committing the Federal Government to an increase in civil-service employees. You are adding to the bureaucracy which you have been condemning. Yes; you are looking in one direction and you are traveling in another. You are saying one thing and you are meaning another. What are the folks back home going to think about that? I think it would be highly complimentary to this House to wait on this bill and vote when there are more Members present.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTINGTON and Mr. DONDERO.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 11, noes 73.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. 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. HUBER, 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. 5990, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands may meet tomorrow during general debate for further hearings on the CCC bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, George Washington, truly "the Father of our Country," in his Farewell Address, to which we dedicate a day and listen as it is read every year by a Member of the House of Representatives designated by the Speaker, laid bare his great heart when he wrote his yearning for unity.

With every passing year the address to the people of the United States becomes freighted with more meaning, and its wisdom is more apparent in the light of history. Every hearer must be acutely impressed by those passages wherein is expressed his parental solicitude: "That your Union and brotherly affection may be perpetual"; and by the primary injunction:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity in every shape, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes, and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest,

or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

The Blue and Gray Association, Inc., was formed for the sole purpose of building good will between the North and South. It is an institution functioning every day dedicated to the single aim of unifying our Nation.

Kipling sang truly:

But there is neither east nor west, border,
nor breed, nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face,
though they come from the ends of the
earth!

That is the theme song of The Cradle of the Confederacy. Montgomery, Ala., has become these last 12 years the home of the conviction that nothing cements lasting friendships so well as good, clean sports played in an atmosphere of genuine hospitality.

Away down yonder in the land of cotton there has been born and grown a fervent belief that while we may, as Vice President Marshall said, need a good 5-cent cigar, the most important need from a secular standpoint is unification.

What is planned is a national shrine—a field of honor where men of good will are invited to meet from the four points of the compass as well as everywhere in between, forgetting their differences and enjoying together recreation in every known sport.

Beginning 12 years ago the only bowl football game in the Nation scheduled for the last Saturday in each year has been played annually in Cramton Bowl in Montgomery, Ala., following a week of holiday fun and athletic events—track, basketball, tennis, skeet shooting, and similar attractions, in the comfort of golden sunshine, in the great out-of-doors.

Over 200 Members of the Congress are members of the Blue and Gray Association, Inc., many of whom have enjoyed these events during the Christmastide.

The welcome on the door mat of Montgomery is written larger every year. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of Pennsylvania are coming down this year in a motorcade, with their championship fife and drum corps. Let us all go. Leaving right after Christmas, and spend the last week of the year holidaying to get ready for the Eighty-second Congress.

You and yours will love it!

SUPREME COURT DECISION IN UNITED STATES V. CLASSIC

Mr. Speaker, in his column in the Washington Post of Saturday, May 13, 1950, the distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, seems to have missed the point decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States v. Classic et al.* (313 U. S. 299).

In that case the opinion was based on article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The pertinent part of the opinion reads as follows:

Obviously included within the right to choose, secured by the Constitution, is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections.

The soundness of this holding must be conceded by all. No one should defend stealing. I am sure that neither States' righters, however ardent, nor the Attorney General of the United States do, for 1 minute. Nor do they question the law of the land.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE SMITH-BENDER CASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to congratulate the Marine Corps, the Navy Department, and the State Department for their successful efforts in bringing about the release of Chief Electrician's Mate William Smith, of Columbia Falls, Mont.; and Marine Sgt. Elmer Bender, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

As the House knows, those two members of the Armed Forces have been held captive by the Chinese Communists for something like 19 months. While there has been a great deal of criticism relative to this matter, I wish to assure the House, as one who was vitally interested in the release of those people, that the State Department, in my opinion, has done everything it possibly could to bring about the release of these two enlisted men.

I want to extend in the RECORD the correspondence which I have had with the State Department and the Navy Department relative to the holding of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender by the Chinese Communists, so that the House will have an understanding of the great and untiring efforts which have been put forth, and the difficulties which have been encountered and successfully overcome.

I want at this time to extend my best wishes to the family of Sergeant Bender, and also to the family of Chief Electrician's Mate Smith.

Reference was made some time ago in a radio broadcast to a similar occurrence in north Africa during the tenure of President Theodore Roosevelt. At that time an American of Greek descent, by the name of Perdicaris was taken captive by a Moroccan bandit by the name of Raisuli. President Theodore Roosevelt used strong measures at that time to effect the release of this American of Greek descent. He issued his famous ultimatum: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." As a historical matter of fact, the telegram containing these words was sent by Secretary of State John Hay. Because of that ultimatum, Perdicaris was released and returned to his country and to his family.

Times have changed, though, since the early years of the present century, and had we adopted that same policy in the case of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender it might well have brought about the death of those two individuals and pos-

sibly plunged this country into war. In the interest of just what did actually occur, I am inserting in the RECORD this correspondence which I have had with the State Department and the Navy Department, and also a résumé of the development in the Smith-Bender case, which will indicate just what has been done to effectuate the release of those two individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include with those remarks various bits of correspondence, as well as a résumé of the development in the Smith-Bender case.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 29, 1949.

HON. FRANCIS MATTHEWS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Navy Department.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received a letter from Mrs. Charles M. Smith, route 1B, Columbia Falls, Mont., which reads as follows:

"This letter is in reference to my son, William Charles Smith, construction electrician chief, United States Navy, who failed to return from a routine flight over territory controlled by the Chinese Communists in the Tsingtao area on October 19, 1949.

"That was 9 months ago. Since that time we have received word that he and his companion Master Sgt. Elmer C. Bender were held by the Chinese Communists somewhere in China. There seemed so little we could do to help him. We have written to different people asking their help. All seemed very willing, but did not know of any way to help. Yesterday, while in Kalispell, I talked with the men at the radio station KGEZ, and Don Treloar told me you were the only one he knew who could help. That he knew if I wrote to you giving you the whole story you would take hold of it and do more than anyone else can.

"Enclosed you will find a clipping from a recent issue of the Press-Telegram, of Long Beach, Calif. Also two copies of letters that were being sent by their friends from Long Beach to Senators and others who might help in some way. Something must be done very soon. I have spent several months with my son's family recently. I went down last November to be with her when her baby was born December 18. Since that time she has been in poor health with a serious operation pending. Doctors wish to wait, if possible, until her husband can come, although they say the longer they wait the less chance she has to survive. Little Mike, now 2 years old, has been very, very ill the last 2 weeks and frets for "Daddy." He was very much a daddy's boy when his dad left a year ago. There is little Pat, who doesn't know anything about a daddy. Also last October they started to buy a home in Long Beach through GI and FHA. My son had signed the first contract papers. He was taken prisoner before the contract was completed. She did not have power of attorney. She had paid \$1,500 down payment. In May the real estate firm gave her notice to move out. Well, the Navy and other forces showed the firm where they were in the wrong. But still nothing can be done—for a while. So she just stays on. A very distressful situation—if only my son could be returned to the States. And just why hasn't this been done? Can you find out? Of course, I can go to the VFW, American Legion, Navy Mothers, Blue Star Mothers, and all of those, asking each one to

write into Washington, but I'll wait awhile and see what you can find out for us. I will gladly give any further information you might like to have."

I would appreciate your giving this matter your personal attention and letting me know what can be done to have this boy returned to the States.

Thanking you for your assistance, and with best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

AUGUST 10, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This will amplify the acknowledgment of August 2, 1949, referring to your special interest in the case of Chief Construction Electrician William Charles Smith, United States Navy, who is presently in a missing status.

I wish to advise you that Mr. Smith was placed in an officially missing status on October 19, 1948, the date when the plane in which he was a passenger failed to return from a routine flight in the area of Tsingtao, China. On November 4, 1948, a report from the Commander of the Naval Forces in that area was received in the Bureau of Naval Personnel stating that indirect information had been received that the plane had landed in Communist-held territory and that the occupants were alive and well. In a report dated January 17, 1949, this information was corroborated with the additional indirect information that Mr. Smith and Master Sergeant Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, were in Chinese Communist hands, unharmed and in good health. A report received in the Bureau of Naval Personnel on March 22, 1949, again stated that both men were believed to be alive and well.

Subsequently, information was received from an apparently bona fide agent of the command that is holding Mr. Smith that he and Master Sergeant Bender were moved from Hsia Tien, China to Nan Tsun, China, about February 15, 1949. Negotiations were conducted with that agent and a requested written document was prepared and delivered. An answer was received stating that a representative of the Navy would be aided in contacting the highest administrative officials in order to carry on further negotiations for the return of Mr. Smith and his companion. Not having heard to the contrary, the Department of the Navy assumed these latter negotiations were in progress. However, the situation in China, as you are aware, is very turbulent and as a result diplomatic negotiations are constantly being interrupted and hence long drawn out.

When the Department of the Navy felt that too long a period had elapsed without any action being taken by the Communists for the release of the two men, I requested the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, to obtain their release. Mr. Acheson informed me that he had forwarded a dispatch to the American Consul General at Peiping, China, with instructions to approach the Communist authorities in that city in an effort to arrange for the release of Mr. Smith and Master Sergeant Bender. Mr. Acheson further stated that upon receipt of any information relative to the two men the Department of the Navy would be advised immediately. To date no further information has been received regarding Mr. Smith and Master Sergeant Bender.

I wish to assure you that your interest in behalf of Mrs. Smith is appreciated and that upon receipt of further information concerning her son she will be notified promptly.

Sincerely yours,

DAN A. KIMBALL,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

AUGUST 10, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I wish to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of July 29, 1949, addressed to Secretary Acheson enclosing correspondence from Mrs. Charles M. Smith concerning her son, William C. Smith, United States Navy, who is now being held by the Chinese Communists.

Please be assured that since receiving information from the Department of the Navy in April concerning Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender, our diplomatic and consular officials have been doing everything in their power to secure information concerning the welfare of the two men and to secure their return. The American Embassy at Nanking and the American consular officers at Peiping and Tsingtao have made repeated attempts to approach Communist authorities on the subject. Unfortunately, these initial efforts evoked no response. The Department informed relatives of each step in the search for Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender.

On July 9, 1949, the American consul at Tsingtao informed the Department that a responsible member of the Foreign Affairs section of the local Communist regime told the consul that he had personally seen Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender late in May and that they were safe and well. This information was immediately conveyed to their relatives. On July 22 the Department telegraphed its representatives in the field that, in addition to formal approaches to authorities, they should make every effort through informal contacts to secure information as to the welfare of the two men and action looking toward their return.

On July 27 the Department informed Mrs. Smith that it had just received a message from the American consul at Tsingtao stating that he had had personal assurances from a member of the local government that both men were in Tsingtao and were safe and well.

Concerning the date of the release of Mr. Smith, it should be noted that the channels of communication between American official representatives and the local Chinese Communist authorities in the cities mentioned above are extremely tenuous. The Chinese Communist authorities do not recognize the official status of our consular officials and state that in the absence of diplomatic relations foreign consular officials are regarded as private citizens. Written communications addressed by American officials, to the Communist authorities are not acknowledged and it has been impossible to establish direct personal contact with responsible Chinese Communist authorities for the purpose of arranging for the release of Mr. Smith. While an Aliens Affairs Bureau has been established in each of the larger cities, these offices are often unwilling or unable to take effective action in matters concerning foreign nationals.

As Mrs. Smith was assured on July 27, our consul at Tsingtao will continue to follow this case closely and our officers at Nanking and Peiping will make every effort through formal approaches and informal contact to obtain the release of the two men.

Any further information which is received by the Department concerning this case will be conveyed to Mr. Smith's wife and to his mother. The enclosures to your letter are, as requested, returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MIKE: Reference is made to previous communications from you concerning efforts

to obtain from the Chinese Communists additional information with regard to William C. Smith and to secure his release.

For your information there is enclosed a statement sketching the history of the case which the Department released to the press on August 31, 1949. As noted in the press release the matter is again being brought to the attention of the highest Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping. Information concerning any results which may come from this representation will be conveyed at the earliest possible moment to the family of Mr. Smith.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary.

[Enclosure: Press release.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, August 31, 1949.
(For the press)

On October 19, 1948, two American servicemen, William C. Smith, chief construction electrician, United States Navy, of Long Beach, Calif., and Elmer C. Bender, master sergeant, United States Marine Corps, of Cincinnati, Ohio, failed to return from a routine training flight over territory in the Tsingtao area of Shantung Province, China. The two men were members of the United States naval headquarters which was established at Tsingtao at the request of the Government of the Republic of China.

Since receiving reports that the flyers were in territory controlled by the Chinese Communists, the Department of the Navy, through the United States naval headquarters at Tsingtao, and the Department of State, through its representatives at Nanking, Peiping, and Tsingtao, have made repeated attempts to obtain from the Chinese Communists information concerning the men and to secure their release. These initial approaches have been unsuccessful although Smith and Bender have been reported to be safe and well. The matter is again being brought to the attention of the highest Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping.

The Departments of State and Navy remain in contact with the relatives of the two servicemen and will convey to them any additional information which is received.

OCTOBER 18, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MIKE: With reference to previous communications on the subject of Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender, the American servicemen who failed to return from a training flight over the Tsingtao area of China last October, I wish to inform you that the consul at Tsingtao on October 10, 1949, addressed an informal memorandum to the local Communist authorities stressing the humanitarian aspects of the two cases.

Unfortunately, as was true with regard to previous efforts to obtain the release of the men, this approach was without satisfactory response from the local authorities, who were instructed to inform the consul that they no longer know the whereabouts of Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender.

Please be assured that our consular officers in Chinese Communist-controlled areas are continuing their efforts in this case and that all possible avenues are being explored in an effort to obtain additional information concerning Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender and to effect their release.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary.

OCTOBER 27, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I have your letter of October 15, 1949, enclosing a communication from Mrs. Charles M. Smith on the subject of a reported conversation between her son, William G. Smith, and a crewman of the

Panamanian vessel *Eastern Trader* during its recent call at the port of Tsingtao, China.

The Department is endeavoring to obtain additional information concerning the crewman's story from Hong Kong and the future ports of call of the *Eastern Trader*. The Department of the Navy also is making an effort to obtain information from the ship's crew. Let me assure you that any pertinent information which may be obtained from these efforts will be urged in approaching the Communist authorities with regard to the release of Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender.

As mentioned in a letter from Mr. Gross of October 18, the local authorities at Tsingtao have been instructed to state that they no longer know the whereabouts of the two men. The statement of the authorities, of course, does not of itself indicate that the status or welfare of the men has changed; it is considered as emphasizing the refusal of the Communists to discuss matters with representatives of the United States whose official standing they do not recognize.

With reference to the Secretary's letter of October 26 concerning American citizens who are being held in Communist-controlled areas of China, information concerning four additional individuals who have been refused exit permits by the Communist authorities has just been confirmed. As stated in Department's press release No. 825 of the evening of October 26 the following official personnel in China have so far been unable to obtain permits to leave China:

Gen. Robert B. Soule, United States military attaché, Nanking.

Commander Morgan Slayton, assistant United States naval attaché, Shanghai.

Dr. G. G. Schram, United States Public Health officer, Shanghai.

Chief Yeoman Alvin E. Shroul of the naval attaché's office, Shanghai.

Please be assured that the Department's representatives in China are continuing to do all that is in their power to assist Americans who have expressed their desire to leave China.

The enclosure to your letter is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

BEN H. BROWN, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations
(For the Secretary of State).

[Enclosure: Letter from Mrs. Smith.]

LONG BEACH, CALIF., October 12, 1949.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Last week, I came down from Kallispell, to stay a month or so with the family of our son, William C. Smith.

You have likely read the press items over the last week end concerning Bill and Bender. They are being contacted in some prison in Tsingtao by a crewman of the *Eastern Trader*. We were much interested also to learn that their plane had crashed, as that is the first information we have had as to what had happened to them.

We sent a cablegram to the ship's officers asking for information. Today we received a cable from the captain and crew members of the *Eastern Trader* that they regret very much that they are unable to help.

Now that, Bill, and Bender, have been able to get word out that they are still alive, they will expect immediate release and I know every American will help to bring them home safely. Please tell them there in Washington that they have got to help us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CHARLES M. SMITH.

NOVEMBER 22, 1949.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 20 which I have just received and read with much interest.

I was very glad to hear from you, and I am happy to take this occasion to report to you. It just happens on yesterday I had a personal conference with the officials of the State Department relative to your husband and Bender. They assured me personally that they were doing everything they possibly could, and they also said they would see to it that they will do everything in their power to bring about their release at the earliest possible moment. I want to assure you that I am still very much interested in your husband and Bender who may still be together, and that I think it should take precedence over the case of Consul General Ward and his colleagues because, as you indicated, your husband has been held for a considerably longer length of time than Ward and the others. You may be assured of my continued interest and desire to be of assistance to you. You may rest assured also that I will continue to do all I can to keep the State Department busy on this case.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

NOVEMBER 23, 1949.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

MY DEAR Mrs. SMITH: I have just received your letter of November 21 and I hasten to answer because I believe that you have been misinformed.

You will remember the effort which we took by the use of planes flying over Shantung, and by the use of leaflet drops requesting information and the return of your husband and his companion, and by the use of agents throughout Shantung. Although we received several rumors which we invariably followed up, we never received any positive information as to the location of our service mates.

Since the Navy left Tsingtao two or three additional rumors have been received. Throughout this time the State Department has utilized its personnel in China, its agencies, and all available means looking toward the location of your husband and to his return. These negotiations have involved the headquarters of the Communist regime, as well as local authorities. In no case has a satisfactory or conclusive answer been received.

I personally have followed up these attempts to gain some information in the matter and I can assure you that the State Department has not, in my opinion, overlooked any opportunity for favorable action.

I also assure you that the State Department has issued several press releases concerning these activities, but the press in the United States has either not published them or has not given them wide distribution. Therefore the fact that the Angus Ward case has received more public notice is not because of any lack of effort or because of lesser interest on the part of the State Department officials. It may seem to be less but it is really due to the fact that the press has not published the reports in the matter.

I am sure that you will realize that no report has been received which is conclusive as to the whereabouts of your husband.

The other day I was informed that one of the agencies in Tsingtao had reported to our consul that your husband had been seen in that vicinity. This report gave me great cheer and further hope that your husband was safe. At the same time, the State Department began working on the development of this report to check on its truthfulness and accuracy, which would lead to further hopeful negotiations.

Please do not be discouraged to the degree that you might think your husband has been forgotten or overlooked because things like that just do not happen in our service and all possible effort for his recovery will

be carried on by the Navy, Marine Corps, and the State Department. First to ascertain his whereabouts, and, second to obtain his recovery. I shall present your letter to highest State Department officials with the request that they keep you better informed at all times of the situation so as to ease your worries, as much as these unfortunate circumstances permit. Possibly it will be reassuring to you to know of our continued and wholehearted efforts in behalf of you and your husband.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR C. BADGER,
Vice Admiral, United States Navy.

DECEMBER 6, 1949.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: By reference from Admiral Badger, with whom I have had the opportunity to discuss the subject of the detention of your husband by the Chinese Communists, I have received copies of your letter of November 21 and his reply thereto.

I wish to express my wholehearted sympathy for the suffering your husband's absence has caused you and the other members of his family. Please be assured that, as Admiral Badger has stated in his letter, the Navy Department and the Department of State have pursued every realistic means which might conceivably result in the release of your husband and Sergeant Bender.

I deeply regret that you have apparently received the impression that efforts on behalf of your husband have been less energetic than those made in connection with other Americans who have met with the refusal of Chinese Communists to observe the accepted principles of international behavior. The truth of the matter is that our officials have made more efforts in more localities of China to obtain a satisfactory response from the Communists with regard to your husband than in any other case.

I hope you will accept my assurances that the United States Government is most energetically continuing its efforts to obtain your husband's release.

We shall keep you informed of all developments.

Sincerely yours,

W. WALTON BUTTERWORTH,
Assistant Secretary.

DECEMBER 20, 1949.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 18, which has just reached me.

President Truman is not in town as you know but I am once again taking your case up with the State Department and I want to assure you so far as I have been able to find out, the State Department is doing everything it possibly can to bring about the release of your husband and Bender. Yesterday I met with an official of the State Department and made the suggestion to him if at all possible some contact should be made by our Embassy in Moscow where Mao Tse-tung, the head of the Chinese Communist Government, is at the present visiting.

Must close now but please rest assured of my continued interest and desire to be of all possible assistance. With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

(Copy to Mrs. Charles Smith, Route 1B, Columbia Falls, Mont.)

JANUARY 3, 1950.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 30 which I just received.

I immediately called the officials about your allotment and they are wiring the Cleveland office instructing them to give special attention to your case. From what I could find out here, the only thing that would be holding it up is the backlog of work as some 164,000 cases were being changed under the new law. I will however let you know when I receive a report from the Cleveland office which I hope will be within the next day or so. You may be assured that I will see that everything is done so that you can receive your money.

Must close now but with best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

DECEMBER 30, 1949.

DEAR MIKE MANSFIELD: I received this card from Cleveland that my family allowance has been stopped. I know you wrote me that it had been restored but seems as if they didn't get the information.

So would you please see what happened. I need this allotment by the 5th of January as I have bills coming due then.

I appreciate everything you have done for me and thank you very much.

Yours truly,

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

P. S.—The allotment is made out in my name, Ruby R. Smith.

DECEMBER 8, 1949.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 6, which has just reached my desk.

I am immediately contacting the Navy Department about your family allowance and you may be assured that I will do everything that I can to be of all possible assistance to you.

Must close now but will write you as soon as I have anything further to report.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

P. S.—I contacted the Navy Department and your \$100 family allowance will be restored and will be retroactive to date of termination, September 1949.

M. M.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., December 6, 1949.

DEAR Mr. MANSFIELD: I am writing you concerning my family allowance of \$100 per month being stopped. I cannot live on \$150 per month. I must continue to have this family allowance. I have budgeted my living to the \$250 per month I was receiving, and I just made ends meet. I cannot pay my bills and feed, clothe two children with the high cost of living any cheaper than \$250 per month, as I was receiving.

I will appreciate it if you have a talk with the Navy and explain to them that I need the \$100 family allowance.

Enclosed is copy of letter from Navy. Mr. MANSFIELD, I thank you very much for the help you have given us.

Yours truly,

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH.

SPECIAL PAYMENTS DIVISION,
NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Cleveland, Ohio, November 28, 1949.

Mrs. RUBY R. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: Reference is made to the case of your husband, William Charles Smith, chief construction electrician's mate, United States Navy, who has been missing since October 19, 1948.

As your husband's pay has been increased under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, entitlement to family allowance benefits terminated as of Septem-

ber 1949. Your husband's pay account has been adjusted for the October and November 1949 payments.

If the discontinuance of the family allowance payments results in undue hardship and your present dependent allotment of \$150 is inadequate, it is suggested that you request the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Dependent's Welfare Branch, Casualty Section, Washington, D. C., to authorize an increase.

Very truly yours,

D. R. STEWART, LTJG SC USN
(By direction Chief of Field Branch).

JANUARY 25, 1950.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: Your letter of January 21 and enclosed clipping from the Long Beach Tribune have just reached me. I am immediately contacting the State Department about the questions raised by you and also am contacting the Navy Department to see what can be done in the way of legal assistance on your home.

I have been in constant contact with the State Department and they have informed me that they are taking action on my suggestion that the officers of the United States Embassy at Moscow try to contact Mao Tse-tung and others of the Chinese delegation while they are there to see what can be done to effectuate the release of your husband and Sergeant Bender. The Department has sent the Embassy at Moscow a cable requesting that it utilize any available occasion to bring the case to the attention of Chinese Communist diplomatic officials at Moscow and Mao's entourage. At the same time, they have asked our officers at our four posts in Communist-occupied China to continue to do everything they can to bring about the release. I am informed by the State Department that on December 27 they notified you by telegram that the American consul at Tsingtao had learned from local Chinese Communist authorities that your husband was safe and well and was being detained at a military base in the Tsingtao area. With regard to your statement that the Government paid for Angus Ward and staff but is unwilling to pay the ransom the Communists want for your husband's freedom, they informed me that they have already informed you that there is no indication that your husband and Sergeant Bender are being held for ransom. The State Department informed me that they did not pay any ransom for Mr. Ward's release. I am enclosing with this letter some of the previous clippings which you sent me and I will write you when I have anything further to report.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

JANUARY 26, 1950.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR Mrs. SMITH: I have talked with the legal assistant to the Secretary of the Navy relative to your securing power of attorney and after looking into the matter thoroughly, I was informed that you cannot be granted power of attorney by the Government.

They did state that you should have your attorney file a stay of execution with the court under section 522 of title 50 of the United States Code (p. 5697) which is the Sailors and Soldiers Relief Act. Under this law, no further action can be taken on the suit until your husband returns. I believe Mr. Truman is familiar with this and may already have taken such action. I also was informed that the legal officer for the Navy has been in touch with you and if you have any other legal questions, he would be glad to help you further.

The only way the Government could help you so far as this particular matter is concerned, is if some communication could be gotten through to your husband and for him

to make up a power of attorney for you. The chances for this are slim in view of the fact that no direct contact has been successful yet.

Must close now but I want you to know that if there is anything further I can do, please let me know. With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

JANUARY 26, 1950.

LEGAL OFFICER,

United States Naval Station,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. William C. Smith, 141 West Fifty-first Street, Long Beach, Calif., wife of William Charles Smith who is being held by the Chinese Communists, concerning a suit filed against her on the matter of a purchase of a home.

Mrs. Smith does not have power of attorney for her husband. I understand from Secretary Matthews' office that your office has assisted Mrs. Smith in some respects and I would appreciate your again contacting her to see what assistance you might be to her in the matter of this suit which has been filed. I would appreciate your writing to me after you have discussed this matter with her.

Thanking you for any assistance you may give and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER,
UNITED STATES NAVAL BASE LOS ANGELES,
Long Beach, Calif., January 30, 1950.

Re Mrs. William C. Smith.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This will acknowledge receipt of your air-mail letter of January 26, 1950, in regard to Mrs. William C. Smith, wife of William Charles Smith, CEC, United States Navy, presently held by the Chinese Communists, concerning suit filed against her in connection with the purchase of a home.

Please be advised that the legal officer has been in personal contact with Mrs. Smith, as well as her attorney, Rolland Truman, 609 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif., who is handling her case. This office has rendered and is presently rendering Mrs. Smith such legal assistance as is permissible in such matters and the legal officer is maintaining close liaison both with Mrs. Smith and her attorney with respect to the matters confronting her. Upon receipt of your letter in this morning's mail, the legal officer immediately telephoned Mrs. Smith and inquired as to what possible further assistance he might be to her and assured her that he was keeping in close touch with her attorney and he likewise with the legal officer.

You may rest assured that this office will render Mrs. Smith every assistance possible. Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

BRADNER W. LEE, JR.,
Commander, United States Naval
Reserve, Legal Officer.

FEBRUARY 9, 1950.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Your letter of January 26, 1950, to Mr. Butterworth regarding measures which might be taken to forestall the possible eviction of Mrs. William C. Smith from her home in Long Beach, Calif., arrived just after Mr. Butterworth's departure for the Far East, and I am therefore replying in his stead.

The Department has discussed this case with the Navy Department and has written

Mrs. Smith on the subject, suggesting that Mrs. Smith again communicate with the Navy Legal Assistance Officer at San Diego, Calif. I am informed by the Navy Department that he was instructed last fall to help Mrs. Smith with regard to her housing difficulties, that he discussed the matter with Mrs. Smith at that time, and that due in part to his efforts eviction proceedings were at least temporarily suspended.

With regard to your suggestion that the Government endeavor to secure a power of attorney from Chief Smith, the Navy Department is asking Mr. Truman to furnish the Government a power of attorney form suitable both for his purposes and for telegraphic transmission. The Department of State will then telegraph the text of such power of attorney to the British Foreign Office for transmission to the British Consul at Tsingtao with the request that the consul endeavor to obtain Chief Smith's signature on a prepared form. As you are undoubtedly aware, the United States Consulate General at Tsingtao has been closed and the American consular officials have left the city.

The enclosures to your letter are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP D. SPROUSE,
Director for Chinese Affairs.

FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 20 and enclosure.

I talked with the Director of Naval Intelligence and he informed me that they would have to work through the State Department on the release of your husband. As you know, the State Department has made a number of requests for his release, but has not received a reply to any. It would appear doubtful that the Communists would recognize the Navy Department instead of the State Department when they have not acknowledged the State Department heretofore. The State Department is the representative of the Navy Department, and I have been informed that the Communists have been told these were Navy men. I am also informed that Captain Jones went to see General Wong at the request of our American consul, and the Department is now looking into the statements made by Wong to Jones. I expect to have a report from the State Department within the next day or so, which I will forward to you.

Must close now, but please be assured of my continued interest and desire to see that everything is done. With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., February 20, 1950.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Please ask the Secretary of Navy to do all in his power to effect the immediate release of my husband, William Charles Smith, and Elmer Bender, pursuant to recent information furnished the Long Beach Naval Intelligence.

Yours truly,

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH.

P. S.—This is the information Captain Jones gave me I turned over to naval intelligence, also Captain Jones turned the same information to naval intelligence:

February 15, 1950, Capt. David Jones of the freighter *Flying Arrow* arrived in Long Beach and came to see me with confidential information.

Captain Jones told me that General Wong, Chief of Foreign Military Affairs of the Chinese People's Government at Tsingtao, China, sent for him to come to his headquarters for conference.

They talked for about half hour and General Wong said you want to know about Smith

and Bender don't you? Captain Jones told him he did and wished to obtain their release and take them aboard his ship the *Flying Arrow* and bring them back home to their families.

Mr. Wong told Captain Jones that Smith and Bender could be released in a matter of days if the Navy admitted the men were Navy men, and answered the question as to why the men were flying over Communist territory with a camera?

He said the Navy had not asked for their release but prior to their departure from Tsingtao, sent a hurriedly written letter asking that the men be turned over to them.

That they (the Navy) didn't even tell the Communists where to deliver the men.

Wong said, that the State Department had never asked for them by a proper official request as required by them. Wong said, to hell with the State Department, let the Navy claim these men, answer the question and the men would be turned over to the Navy. He said Smith and Bender were like hot potatoes in China, due to the publicity and that they wanted to get rid of them, by turning them over to the Navy. The questions the Chinese want answered before their release of Smith and Bender:

1. Let the Navy claim these men—say they are United States Navy.
2. Are they really United States Navy enlisted men?
3. Why were they flying plane over Communist territory?
4. Why did they have camera in plane?

Answer of these questions by Navy authorities will bring the release of these men.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 24, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Your letter to Mr. Butterworth dated February 14, 1950, enclosing a letter to you from Mrs. Charles M. Smith, has been referred to me for reply in view of Mr. Butterworth's absence from the Department. I believe the following information will be useful to you in replying to Mrs. Smith.

With reference to Mrs. Smith's suggestion that the Department may never have made a proper request to the Chinese Communist authorities for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, United States Government representatives at Peiping have requested their release in writing five times, in formal communications addressed to the general headquarters of the Peoples Liberation Army, the Communist Alien Affairs Office, and Chou En-lai personally. In addition, numerous written and oral representations have been made by diplomatic and consular officials at Nanking, Tsingtao, Shanghai, and Tientsin. Mrs. Smith has been informed of these approaches. In each instance it was requested that the men be released for repatriation to the United States and, in the interim, allowed to correspond with their families in the United States. As in other cases, the Communist authorities ignored our communications. The Communist official at Tsingtao who reportedly informed Captain Jones of the *Flying Arrow* that the United States had not made a proper request for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender was either unaware of our previous representations or was willfully distorting the facts (it is, of course, also possible that in his opinion the United States previous requests were not proper because due to nonrecognition our representatives had no official standing in China).

With regard to the statement that the United States paid extortion money to the Chinese Communists for the release of consular personnel at Mukden, the Government paid only the cost of transporting the consular party, their personal effects, and a considerable amount of consular equipment from Mukden to Tientsin, where the group embarked for the United States. The ques-

tion of payment of travel costs for Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender will, of course, not arise until the Communists agree to their release. The Department has already discussed with Mrs. Smith the possibility that the men are being held for ransom, and has advised her that the United States Government has received no indication that such is the case. As you are aware, Captain Jones, without authorization from the Government, offered the Communist authorities at Tsingtao the sum of \$25,000 to pay expenses for their release and was informed in reply that the men were not being held for ransom.

I suggest you inform Mrs. Smith that it is the view of the Department of State that it is highly unlikely that a blockade of Chinese Communist ports such as she suggests would be successful in effecting the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender. Such action would be more likely to prolong their detention and perhaps inspire reprisals threatening their personal safety.

In accordance with your request I am returning Mrs. Smith's letter.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP D. SPROUSE,
Director for Chinese Affairs.

MAY 3, 1950.

Mrs. CHARLES M. SMITH,
Columbia Falls, Mont.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: I am enclosing letter and report I have received from the Assistant Secretary of State. I will write you as soon as I have a further report.

Must close now but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MAY 2, 1950.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MIKE: Thank you for your letter dated April 22, 1950, enclosing for the Department's consideration letters you have received from Mrs. Charles M. Smith and Mr. Ted C. Yeager regarding Mr. Yeager's offer to proceed to Communist China to negotiate for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender. The Department is now considering the desirability of Mr. Yeager's proposed trip from the standpoint of the personal risk involved as well as the effect which his representations might have upon British negotiations on behalf of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, now in progress at Peiping. The Department will advise you of its reaction, returning the enclosures to your letter, in the very near future.

In response to your request for information on the case, I am enclosing two copies of a report prepared in the Department on April 27, including a full and up-to-date account of the Government's efforts to secure the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender and the latest information received in the Department regarding their welfare and whereabouts.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK,
Assistant Secretary.

[Enclosure: Two copies of memorandum dated April 27, 1950.]

RÉSUMÉ OF DEVELOPMENTS IN SMITH-BENDER CASE

APRIL 27, 1950.

On October 19, 1948, Construction Electrician Chief William C. Smith, United States Navy, and Master Sergeant Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, failed to return from a regularly scheduled local familiarization flight in the area of Tsingtao, China. The men were members of the United States Naval Headquarters which was established at the request of the Government of China. They were reported to be flying a light observation-type aircraft, probably an L-5. Presumably Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender ran out of fuel or encountered engine

trouble and were forced to land in Communist-occupied territory. Pilots at the Naval Headquarters had standing instructions to avoid flying over Communist territory. However, the lines of battle were extremely fluid, and Communist advances on the perimeter of Tsingtao gradually reduced the Nationalist-held area available for flight operations, making these instructions very difficult to observe. To the Navy Department's knowledge, the aircraft carried no cameras or special equipment whatsoever, since the flight was merely for training purposes.

Between October 1948 and April 1949 the Headquarters of the Commander, Naval Forces, West Pacific, made numerous efforts to locate the two men. Naval and Marine forces in Tsingtao conducted for several days an intensive air search of the land and sea area within a radius of a hundred miles of the city. In addition leaflets were dropped from aircraft on the village of Hsia-Tien, where the two men were reportedly being held at that time, in an attempt to get in touch with responsible Communist authorities. On February 23, 1949, the commanding officer, Third Marines, in Tsingtao, sent a letter to the chief Communist political officer for East Shantung requesting the release of the two men. No satisfactory reply was received. During this period the Red Cross, through its representatives in Tsingtao and in the United States, kept the dependents informed of developments, transmitting unconfirmed reports received from Chinese sources to the effect that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender were being detained by the Communists but were safe and well.

In a letter of April 13, 1949, the Acting Secretary of the Navy requested the Department of State to endeavor to secure through diplomatic channels information concerning the welfare and whereabouts of the men, and to attempt to negotiate for their release. Immediately upon receipt of this request, the Department of State instructed the Consul General at Peiping to take the case up with Communist authorities there. The following is a chronological outline of the Consul General's written approaches to the Peiping authorities:

April 25, 1949: A request for their release was submitted to the Communist Alien Affairs Office, which stated orally that it had no jurisdiction in the case.

April 26, 1949: The case was submitted to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army.

June 7, 1949: A second communication was sent to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army.

August 3, 1949: A third communication was sent to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, stating that reports from Tsingtao indicated that the men were well and under detention in the vicinity of Tsingtao and again requesting their release.

August 30, 1949: A letter was sent to Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, requesting that he take action in the case.

November 25, 1949: A letter was written to Chu En-lai, in charge of foreign affairs for the Chinese Communist regime, stressing the humanitarian aspects of the case and requesting action by the Communist authorities.

After the Communist forces took over Nanking and Tsingtao the Department instructed United States representatives in those cities to make similar approaches to the local authorities. On July 22, 1949, the Department instructed its posts in Peiping, Nanking, and Tsingtao to supplement their official approaches with informal inquiries. Similar instructions were later sent to United States consular posts at Tientsin and Hong Kong.

The Communists have refused to respond to any of these formal or informal approaches. Written communications have

been ignored. They have given no explanation of the reason for the detention of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, and no indication as to when they will be released. The channels of communication between American official representatives in China and the Communist authorities were always extremely tenuous since in the absence of diplomatic relations the Communists refused to recognize the official status of our consular personnel, regarding them merely as private citizens. On November 30, the Secretary of State pointed out that the Chinese Communist authorities were apparently unaware that the international practice of civilized countries for many years has recognized that consuls should be afforded full opportunity for the proper conduct of their duties in the protection of their nationals. He emphasized that American public and official opinion which has been deeply concerned about these violations of accepted international procedures was now thoroughly indignant over the inhumane treatment which continues to be accorded these two American citizens and the hardship and suffering being experienced by their families.

On January 18 the Department of State arranged for the transmission of a message to Captain David Jones, Master of the *Flying Arrow*, requesting that he interview Communist authorities at Tsingtao in an effort to obtain the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender for repatriation aboard his ship. The American and British consular officials at Tsingtao were informed of this request and asked to provide Captain Jones all possible assistance.

Captain Jones discussed the case with Mr. Wong, a Tsingtao Communist official described as the director of the military foreign affairs control board, on January 21. He was advised by Mr. Wong that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender were being detained 80 miles northeast of Tsingtao; that they were well cared for and in good health and spirits; and that their only requirement was English language reading material. Mr. Wong refused to arrange for the release of the men for repatriation aboard the *Flying Arrow*. He also refused to allow Captain Jones to visit them to obtain from them letters to their families in the United States. Captain Jones offered to pay \$25,000 as "expenses" for their release, but was informed by Mr. Wong that the men were not being held for ransom. (The United States Government did not authorize Captain Jones to offer money for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender; in this connection, the Communist authorities have never given the Government any indication that ransom was in fact involved.) Mr. Wong insisted that their release must be effected through official channels and indicated that the United States Navy should make an official request, since previous Navy approaches had not been considered satisfactory by the Chinese Communist authorities.

Mr. Wong's remarks regarding the United States representations to date on behalf of Smith and Bender were not strictly in accord with the facts and the Government was not inclined to rely upon his suggestions. Nevertheless, in order to exploit fully every possibility for effecting the release of the men, the United States Naval Attaché in China addressed several notes to the highest Communist authorities at Peiping, once again identifying Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender as United States Naval personnel, describing briefly the nature of their flight and the circumstances which forced them to land in Communist-occupied territory and suggesting arrangements for their repatriation to the United States. No reply was received to any of these communications.

In order to obtain similar details from time to time in the future regarding the welfare and whereabouts of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, the Department instructed the Consulate General at Hong Kong in the

future to request the masters of American merchant vessels calling at Tsingtao to make an approach to the local Communist authorities similar to that made by Captain Jones, if at all possible. Recently an official of a United States shipping line, traveling on board an American vessel which called at Tsingtao, was unsuccessful in his attempts to obtain an interview with the local authorities.

On January 31, 1950, Gen. George C. Marshall, president of the American Red Cross, sent a telegram to Gen. Chu Teh, commander of the Chinese Communist Peoples Liberation Army at Peiping, requesting that he give his personal attention to the matter of the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, and in the meantime enable them to communicate with their families. General Marshall's request was made on humanitarian grounds "in the true spirit of the world-wide Red Cross movement." No response to this request was received.

The American Red Cross has informed the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva of the details surrounding the detention of the men and has advised the Department that delegates of the International Red Cross Committee in Tsingtao and Shanghai are now endeavoring to assist in efforts to effect the release of the men.

On February 5, in order to investigate fully the avenue of approach suggested to Captain Jones, of the *Flying Arrow*, by Mr. Wong, Communist official at Tsingtao, the Secretary of the Navy sent a telegram to General Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, requesting the speedy release and return of the men. This communication, like all other previous approaches, elicited no response.

The most recent information received from Communist authorities in the Tsingtao area indicates that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender are in good health and are confined near the city of Laiyang, approximately 80 miles northeast of Tsingtao. The British consul at Tsingtao has recently made several approaches to local Communist officials, but has been unable to obtain any information other than the usual reports that the men are safe and well and under detention in the Tsingtao area. Tsingtao Communist officials have consistently maintained that representations for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender must be conducted on an official level at Peiping. Now that the British are in the process of establishing diplomatic relations with the Chinese Communist regime, the Department has asked the British Foreign Office to approach the Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping regarding the release of the men. The Communist regime's refusal to respond to this country's numerous approaches to date is apparently based on the pretext of non-recognition. It is hoped, therefore, that the British representations which are now in progress may be more successful.

MAY 4, 1950.

Mrs. CHARLES M. SMITH,
Columbia Falls, Mont.

MY DEAR MRS. SMITH: Thank you for your letter dated April 19, regarding Mr. Ted Yeager's offer to go to China as a Government representative to negotiate for the release of your son and Sergeant Bender.

You are aware from previous correspondence that Government representatives at consular posts throughout China—men who have had considerable experience in dealing with the Chinese—have endeavored through verbal and written approaches to the Peiping authorities to arrange the release of the men. These approaches have been ignored altogether by the Chinese Communists on the pretext that, in the absence of diplomatic relations, United States Government representatives have no status in China. Under such circumstances negotiations through British

channels on a diplomatic level seem to offer greater hope for success. While these negotiations are in progress it would appear inadvisable to authorize independent action by a United States Government representative. Not only would such action offer little hope of success in view of the past experience of United States Government representatives, but it might well affect adversely the outcome of the British negotiations.

Should Mr. Yeager desire, however, to go to China in a personal capacity, the Department would of course give his passport application careful consideration. Few passports have been issued to date for travel in Communist China, due chiefly to the dangers involved in such travel. Foreigners traveling in Communist China are subjected to considerable risk at the present time, due to unsettled conditions, disrupted communications, and, in certain places, the scarcity of food and other necessities of life. American citizens have found the attitude of the Chinese Communist authorities completely unpredictable. It is, of course, possible that the Communists might adopt an uncooperative or even openly hostile attitude toward Mr. Yeager's mission, and refuse to grant him a permit to leave the country. Several Americans in China are in such a predicament at the present time. As you know, the treatment accorded United States diplomatic and consular officials by the Chinese Communist regime has made it most difficult for them to provide even the most routine protective services on behalf of American citizens in the area. United States diplomatic and consular posts in Communist China have now been closed, and what slight protection and assistance they were able to provide to American travelers will no longer be available. It is generally the Department's practice to decline to issue passports for travel in areas of the world where no United States consular protection can be afforded.

If, however, Mr. Yeager is interested in making the proposed trip in spite of the adverse circumstances described above, it is suggested that he address a letter to the Department of State, requesting the necessary passport application forms, whereupon his application will be given full consideration.

Sincerely yours,

TROY L. PERKINS,
Officer in Charge, Political Affairs,
Office of Chinese Affairs
(For the Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 8, 1950.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MIKE: With further reference to your letter dated April 22, 1950, regarding Mr. Ted C. Yeager's offer to proceed to China to seek the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, I am enclosing a copy of a letter dated May 4, 1950, to Mrs. Charles M. Smith which explains in detail the Department's views on the subject.

The Department has expressed to Mrs. Smith the opinion that it would be inadvisable for the Government to authorize Mr. Yeager to negotiate officially with the Chinese Communists, and has pointed out in detail the risks to which Mr. Yeager would be subjected in undertaking such a venture in Communist China. We have, however, agreed to examine Mr. Yeager's passport application in the light of existing circumstances and conditions in Communist China, should he desire to make the trip in a purely private capacity and request a passport for that purpose.

I am returning the enclosures to your letter, in accordance with your request.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK,
Assistant Secretary.

MAY 11, 1950.

Mrs. CHARLES SMITH,
Columbia Falls, Mont.:

State Department and Marines have confirmed reports Bill Smith and Bender on British ship *Hunan*. British official saw boys and they look good. Arrangements will be made to fly boys home from Hong Kong. *Hunan* due in Hong Kong May 15 or 16.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress.

COLUMBIA FALLS, MONT., May 13, 1950.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I have been trying for 2 or 3 days to write you a letter to properly thank you for all the fine things you have done for us. But I just cannot find the right words and phrases to even begin to tell you what your kindness and thoughtfulness has meant to us in these last trying months.

You have ever been our bringer of good tidings. I have before me your telegram of the 11. Your wonderful letter of May 9. Today brought another special delivery from your Secretary, Mr. Sullivan, with more and more good news of our son and Sergeant Bender.

When I listened to you speak yesterday morning from Missoula I wished I could have been there so I could have thanked you in person, and hoped that you might find time to come up to the Flathead, but heard later that you continued on to Butte. If you ever get up in this part of Flathead we would like you to know you will always be welcome at the Smith home.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. CHARLES M. SMITH.

RÉSUMÉ OF DEVELOPMENTS IN SMITH-BENDER CASE

On October 19, 1948, Construction Electrician Chief William C. Smith, United States Navy, and Master Sgt. Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, failed to return from a regularly scheduled local familiarization flight in the area of Tsingtao, China. The men were members of the United States Naval Headquarters which was established at the request of the Government of China. They were reported to be flying a light observation-type aircraft, probably an L-5. Presumably Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender ran out of fuel or encountered engine trouble and were forced to land in Communist-occupied territory. Pilots at the naval headquarters had standing instructions to avoid flying over Communist territory. However, the lines of battle were extremely fluid, and Communist advances on the perimeter of Tsingtao gradually reduced the Nationalist-held area available for flight operations, making these instructions very difficult to observe. To the Navy Department's knowledge, the aircraft carried no cameras or special equipment whatsoever, since the flight was merely for training purposes.

Between October 1948 and April 1949 the Headquarters of the Commander, Naval Forces, West Pacific, made numerous efforts to locate the two men. Naval and Marine forces in Tsingtao conducted for several days an intensive air search of the land and sea area within a radius of a hundred miles of the city. In addition, leaflets were dropped from aircraft on the village of Hsia-Tien, where the two men were reportedly being held at that time, in an attempt to get in touch with responsible Communist authorities. On February 23, 1949, the commanding officer, Third Marines, in Tsingtao, sent a letter to the chief Communist political officer for East Shantung requesting the release of the two men. No satisfactory reply was received. During this period the Red Cross, through its representatives in Tsingtao and in the United States, kept the dependents informed of developments, trans-

mitting unconfirmed reports received from Chinese sources to the effect that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender were being detained by the Communists but were safe and well.

In a letter of April 13, 1949, the Acting Secretary of the Navy requested the Department of State to endeavor to secure through diplomatic channels information concerning the welfare and whereabouts of the men, and to attempt to negotiate for their release. Immediately upon receipt of this request, the Department of State instructed the consular general at Peiping to take the case up with Communist authorities there. The following is a chronological outline of the consular general's written approaches to the Peiping authorities:

April 25, 1949: A request for their release was submitted to the Communist Alien Affairs Office, which stated orally that it had no jurisdiction in the case.

April 26, 1949: The case was submitted to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army.

June 7, 1949: A second communication was sent to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army.

August 3, 1949: A third communication was sent to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, stating that reports from Tsingtao indicated that the men were well and under detention in the vicinity of Tsingtao and again requesting their release.

August 30, 1949: A letter was sent to Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, requesting that he take action in the case. There was no reply.

November 25, 1949: A letter was written to Chou En-lai, in charge of foreign affairs for the Chinese Communist regime, stressing the humanitarian aspects of the case and requesting action by the Communist authorities. This letter was returned in a different envelope.

After the Communist forces took over Nanking and Tsingtao the Department instructed United States representatives in those cities to make similar approaches to the local authorities. On July 22, 1949, the Department instructed its posts in Peiping, Nanking, and Tsingtao to supplement their official approaches with informal inquiries. Similar instructions were later sent to United States consular posts at Tientsin and Hong Kong.

The Communists have refused to respond to any of these formal or informal approaches. Written communications have been ignored. They have given no explanation of the reason for the detention of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, and no indication as to when they will be released. The channels of communication between American official representatives in China and the Communist authorities were always extremely tenuous since in the absence of diplomatic relations the Communists refused to recognize the official status of our consular personnel, regarding them merely as private citizens. On November 30, the Secretary of State pointed out that the Chinese Communist authorities were apparently unaware that the international practice of civilized countries for many years has recognized that consuls should be afforded full opportunity for the proper conduct of their duties in the protection of their nationals. He emphasized that American public and official opinion which has been deeply concerned about these violations of accepted international procedures was now thoroughly indignant over the inhumane treatment which continues to be accorded these two American citizens and the hardship and suffering being experienced by their families.

On January 18 the Department of State arranged for the transmission of a message to Captain David Jones, master of the *Flying Arrow*, requesting that he interview Com-

munist authorities at Tsingtao in an effort to obtain the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender for repatriation aboard his ship. The American and British consular officials at Tsingtao were informed of this request and asked to provide Captain Jones all possible assistance.

Captain Jones discussed the case with Mr. Wong, a Tsingtao Communist official, described as "the Director of the Military Foreign Affairs Control Board," on January 21. He was advised by Mr. Wong that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender were being detained 80 miles northeast of Tsingtao; that they were well cared for and in good health and spirits; and that their only requirement was English-language reading material. Mr. Wong refused to arrange for the release of the men for repatriation aboard the *Flying Arrow*. He also refused to allow Captain Jones to visit them to obtain from them letters to their families in the United States. Captain Jones offered to pay \$25,000 as expenses for their release, but was informed by Mr. Wong that the men were not being held for ransom. (The United States Government did not authorize Captain Jones to offer money for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender; in this connection, the Communist authorities have never given the Government any indication that ransom was in fact involved.) Mr. Wong insisted that their release must be effected through official channels and indicated that the United States Navy should make an official request, since previous Navy approach had not been considered satisfactory by the Chinese Communist authorities.

Mr. Wong's remarks regarding the United States representations to date on behalf of Smith and Bender were not strictly in accord with the facts and the Government was not inclined to rely upon his suggestions. Nevertheless, in order to exploit fully every possibility for effecting the release of the men, the United States naval attaché in China addressed several notes to the highest Communist authorities at Peiping, once again identifying Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender as United States naval personnel, describing briefly the nature of their flight and the circumstances which forced them to land in Communist-occupied territory and suggesting arrangements for their repatriation to the United States. No reply was received to any of these communications.

In order to obtain similar details from time to time in the future regarding the welfare and whereabouts of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, the Department instructed the consulate general at Hong Kong in the future to request the masters of American merchant vessels calling at Tsingtao to make an approach to the local Communist authorities similar to that made by Captain Jones, if at all possible. Recently an official of a United States shipping line, traveling on board an American vessel which called at Tsingtao, was unsuccessful in his attempts to obtain an interview with the local authorities.

On January 31, 1950, Gen. George C. Marshall, president of the American Red Cross, sent a telegram to Gen. Chu Teh, commander of the Chinese Communist peoples liberation army at Peiping, requesting that he give his personal attention to the matter of the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender and in the meantime enable them to communicate with their families. General Marshall's request was made on humanitarian grounds in the true spirit of the worldwide Red Cross movement. No response to this request was received.

The American Red Cross has informed the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva of the details surrounding the detention of the men and has advised the Department that delegates of the International Red Cross Committee in Tsingtao and Shang-

hai are now endeavoring to assist in efforts to effect the release of the men.

On February 5, in order to investigate fully the avenue of approach suggested to Captain Jones of the *Flying Arrow* by Mr. Wong, Communist official at Tsingtao, the Secretary of the Navy sent a telegram to Gen. Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist peoples liberation army, requesting the speedy release and return of the men. This communication, like all other previous approaches, elicited no response.

The most recent information received from Communist authorities in the Tsingtao area indicates that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender are in good health and are confined near the city of Laiyang, approximately 80 miles northeast of Tsingtao. The British consul at Tsingtao has recently made several approaches to local Communist officials, but has been unable to obtain any information other than the usual reports that the men are safe and well and under detention in the Tsingtao area. Tsingtao Communist officials have consistently maintained that representations for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender must be conducted on an official level at Peiping. Now that the British are in the process of establishing diplomatic relations with the Chinese Communist regime, the Department has asked the British Foreign Office to approach the Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping regarding the release of the men. The Communist regime's refusal to respond to this country's numerous approaches to date is apparently based on the pretext of nonrecognition. It is hoped, therefore, that the British representations which are now in progress may be more successful.

LETTER FROM THE AMERICAN CONSUL GENERAL AT PEIPING TO CHOU EN-LAI, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 1949

Under instructions of my Government, I invite your attention to the case of two United States Navy personnel, Tech. Sgt. Elmer C. Bender and Chief Electrician's Mate William C. Smith, who failed to return to their base after a regularly scheduled routine flight in the Tsingtao area on October 19, 1948, the small training land plane that they were using presumably having come down in Communist-controlled territory. Reports received at the time indicated that the two men had landed safely and were held in the first instance near Nantsun in the Tsingtao vicinity.

This matter was submitted to the Peiping Alien Affairs Office on April 25, but that office stated orally that the matter was outside their jurisdiction and that they were therefore not in a position to discuss the matter. The case was thereupon submitted to the general headquarters of the People's Liberation Army in a letter of April 26, 1949, with the request that arrangements be made for the return of those Navy personnel to their base. On June 7, being in nonreceipt of a reply to that letter, I sent a second communication to the general headquarters. That letter likewise remained without a reply. On August 3 I informed the general headquarters in a new letter that a representative of the Tsingtao alien affairs office on July 23 had told a member in the American consulate general at that place that Messrs. Bender and Smith were then in Tsingtao and were well. I again requested that the general headquarters take such action as might be requisite to cause the early release by the Tsingtao military authorities of the two American Navy personnel. In nonreceipt likewise of a reply to that latest communication, on August 30 I addressed a letter directly to Gen. Chu Teh as commander in chief of the People's Liberation Army, bringing the matter to his attention and requesting that he cause there to be taken appropriate action for the release of the two

Americans. A copy of that letter is enclosed for your information.

The consulate general at Tsingtao on October 10 delivered an informal memorandum regarding the matter to the alien affairs office at that point, inviting their attention particularly to the humanitarian aspects of the case. A representative of the Alien Affairs Office on October 12 orally informed the consulate general that, while the humanitarian aspects of the case were appreciated, he had been instructed to state that the local authorities no longer knew the whereabouts of the two men. Respecting the above-mentioned humanitarian aspects of the case, I invite your attention to the fact that the two Americans have now been held for over 1 year without any explanation as to the reason for their detention, and that during that time it has been impossible for them to communicate with their families, with considerable suffering and unhappiness as a result. The wife of Chief Electrician's Mate Smith on December 18, 1948, gave birth to a son, regarding who Mr. Smith has received no word and, moreover, must have an operation which the doctors have advised postponing until his return. I now bring this matter to your attention with the request that the matter be handled in accordance with established principles of the international committee, and that you cause an early investigation of the matter to be made, to the end that the two men shall be released.

It is requested that in the interim—a time which it is hoped will be short—the men be permitted to communicate with their families with respect to their personal welfare, this request being made particularly because of the humanitarian aspects involved.

MESSAGE FROM SECRETARY OF NAVY MATTHEWS TO GENERAL CHU TEH (DELIVERED BY CONSULATE GENERAL, PEIPING, APRIL 7, 1950)

As the general may be aware, two young American servicemen, Chief Construction Electrician's Mate William C. Smith, United States Navy, and Technical Sergeant Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, have been missing since October 19, 1948, when they failed to return from a routine training flight in the Tsingtao area. Since that time, over 17 months ago, they have been held incommunicado and repeated efforts to obtain their release have failed. The extreme mental anguish suffered by their families and friends has been reflected in their continuing appeals to me for assistance in restoring their loved ones to them.

The general will undoubtedly agree that the protracted detention of these two enlisted men cannot possibly serve any military or political purpose. From the humanitarian viewpoint, the prolonged separation of these men from their families and friends seems an unnecessary cruelty—incomprehensible to their families and to the public all over the world.

Recent information indicates that Smith and Bender are at a camp located near Tsingtao. Since United States and other foreign merchant vessels frequently visit this port, it is urged that these men be released without delay and delivered to the master of any foreign ship calling there. If this is not practicable, it is requested that the two men be delivered to the senior United States consular representative in Peiping.

It is earnestly hoped that the general will personally consider this case and use his authority to permit Bender and Smith to rejoin their families in the very near future. Signed Francis P. Matthews, Secretary of the Navy of the United States of America.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS REGARDING SMITH-BENDER CASE

MARCH 10, 1950.

Gen. George C. Marshall, president of the American Red Cross, has sent a telegram to

General Chu Teh, commander of the Chinese Communist Peoples Liberation Army at Peiping, regarding the detention of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender by the Chinese Communists. No reply has been received.

The following is the text of General Marshall's telegram:

"I should like to direct your personal attention to the plight of two members of the United States Navy, Elmer C. Bender and William C. Smith, and of their immediate families.

"It has been brought to my attention that on October 19, 1948, these men failed to return from a routine training flight in the Tsingtao area. Also, I have learned that the United States Government, through its representatives at Nanking, Peiping, and Tsingtao, has made repeated attempts since that time to make it possible for the men to communicate with their families and to bring about their release. In addition, communications on the subject have been sent to the Aliens Affairs Office and to the general headquarters of the People's Liberation Army. To date all these attempts have brought no satisfactory result.

"Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender are married. Mr. Smith has a son born over a year ago whom he has never seen. The families have not heard from them since their disappearance 14 months ago. Quite naturally they are experiencing considerable hardship and suffering. Having been unsuccessful in obtaining direct communication with and effecting the release of their husbands, the wives of these two men have appealed to the American Red Cross for help. Their request is quite in order because under its charter, the American National Red Cross is charged with the responsibility of acting as a means of communication between the individuals in the armed forces of the United States and their families. When circumstances prevent ready communication and as a result the welfare of the man and his family is jeopardized, it is the duty of the Red Cross to take whatever steps it deems necessary to try to reinstate communication and, if humanly possible, to bring about a change in these circumstances.

"Therefore, in the true spirit of the worldwide Red Cross movement and on humanitarian grounds, I urge that you give your personal attention to the matter of the release of these men. In the meantime, I urge that you make it possible for them to communicate with their anxious families."

The American Red Cross reports that delegates of the International Red Cross Committee at Tsingtao and Shanghai have been advised of the detention of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender and are working to effect the release of the men.

A Chinese Communist official at Tsingtao, in discussing the detention of the men with Captain Jones, of the *Flying Arrow*, reportedly suggested that their release might be effected through further Navy representations. Some of the remarks made by this official regarding the United States representations to date do not correspond with the facts, and the Government is not inclined to rely upon his suggestions. Nevertheless, in order to exploit fully every possibility of effecting their release, the United States naval attaché in China has addressed a note to the highest Communist authorities at Peiping, once again identifying Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender as United States naval personnel, describing briefly the nature of the flight and the circumstances which forced them to land in Communist-occupied territory, and suggesting arrangements for their repatriation to the United States.

RELEASE OF SMITH AND BENDER

MAY 9, 1950.

The following is the full text of the Chinese Communist radio broadcast, datelined Peiping, May 8, regarding the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender:

"Gen. Hsu Shih-yu, commander of the Shantung military district of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China, made the following statement on the release of the two United States airmen who have been held prisoners here for some time:

"A plane of the United States Navy which invaded the air of our country landed near Tayenchia, village in Lungshan district of Haiyang County in Kiaotung Peninsula, at about 12:30 a. m., October 19, 1948. The plane and two airmen, E. C. Bender and W. C. Smith, were taken prisoners.

"The headquarters of the Shantung military district, People's Liberation Army, immediately examined the captured plane and its crew. It was discovered that the plane was an L-5 craft, with markings O Y O 2767, a type which could be used for reconnoitering purposes, carrying charts and various military maps of the No. 44 field survey team of the United States espionage organization (external service department, NCNA). At the same time, it was also discovered that E. C. Bender and W. C. Smith were on active service in the United States armed forces. A decision was therefore made to detain the plane and to hold the crew in custody as prisoners of war. However, E. C. Bender and W. C. Smith firmly refused to reveal the motive and mission of this unlawful flight.

"It was not until lately that Bender and Smith, influenced by our magnanimous policy toward prisoners, began to confess and stated that the objective of the flight was to reconnoiter the railways because there was a report at that time to the effect that there were activities along the railways of liberated areas.

"At the same time, the flight was to discover what constructional projects were under way in Laiyang because they had had a report saying that the People's Liberation Army was maintaining great numbers of troops there. Bender also admitted that Major Lantz told me where I must (* * * (word uncopyable—Editor) and that Smith's job was to reconnoiter constructional projects along the route taken by us."

"Their confession said further that the route to be taken by the plane was: Take off from Changkow Airfield near Tsingtao, reconnoiter along railways, then head for Laiyang to reconnoiter military constructional works, and then turn back to Tsingtao. But on their way the plane landed in Haiyang County.

"The above facts and confession prove that the aim of this United States imperialist airplane flight was to invade our territorial air and with the purpose of carrying out planned military reconnaissance to help the anticolonial war of the Kuomintang brigands.

"On the basis of the above facts, the Shantung military headquarters has decided to confiscate the airplane which intruded into Chinese territorial air for conducting military reconnaissance. Since Bender and Smith have confessed their repentance, they are being released and deported in line with the magnanimous policy of the Chinese People's Liberation Army toward prisoners.

"Facts have revealed that the American imperialists have repeatedly committed criminal actions in helping the Kuomintang gang by dispatch of their military personnel in airplanes to intrude into Chinese territorial air and spy on military movements of the People's Liberation Army.

"On April 5, 1948, an American plane with four American military personnel was captured by the People's Liberation Army at Hung Shih Ya, of Chiaohsien, about 80 kilometers northwest of Tsingtao. Subsequently, on June 29 of last year, Oscar C. Badger, then commander of the United States Western Pacific Fleet, admitted their mistakes in a personal letter and guaranteed that no similar occurrence would happen

again. The captured American personnel were then released.

"Such criminal actions of the American imperialists in encroaching on the sovereign rights of China and aiding the Kuomintang gang to conduct war against the Chinese people have long been detested by people throughout China. Any subversive activity of the American imperialists encroaching on the sacred sovereign rights of China will be dealt with ruthlessly by the Chinese people."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MAIL DELIVERIES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a telegram which reads as follows:

We have received practically no mail since railroad strike began; plenty of trucks making regular trips Chicago to our section available. Where is planning for southwestern Michigan done? Kindly advise by wire. Best regards.

G. K. FERGUSON,
Watervliet Paper Co.

Talking with Mr. George E. Miller, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, in charge of surface postal transport, he advised that the routing of mail is in charge of their general superintendents and district superintendents in the field.

For the southwestern Michigan area, routing is under the general superintendent at Cleveland; probably also district superintendents at Chicago, Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Toledo.

He said Michigan Central is only making one round trip a day between Detroit and Chicago; that they are sending Detroit mail over the Pere Marquette and other mail for good portion of Michigan on the Grand Trunk to Battle Creek, and then trucking it from Battle Creek; also trucking into Detroit from Cleveland, and from Toledo, as no train service there.

Could send mail over B. & O., but part of its tracks run over Michigan Central and B. & O. employees respecting picket line.

From the editor of the Sturgis Journal under date of May 12, there comes a letter which reads as follows:

THE STURGIS JOURNAL,
Sturgis, Mich., May 12, 1950.

MR. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARE: I assume that you are aware of what this railroad strike is doing to the towns in your district as well as the State of Michigan.

There hasn't been any passenger or freight service in or out of Sturgis now for three days and the news today does not look too hopeful.

What the answer is I do not know but how our Government can tolerate such a situation is beyond my understanding. The railroad firemen are striking despite the fact that their claims were denied by two presidential fact finding boards.

If the Journal does not get a carload of paper now on the way from Canada by June 1 we will have to suspend operations. We do not have storage space for more than a carload at a time in our plant.

I realize that Congress is probably helpless to do anything about it and Truman is 2,000 miles away dedicating dams.

This failure of rail service is also showing up the inefficiency of the postal service.

Of the 14 villages and towns where the Journal maintains carrier delivery service the post office cannot get our papers there in time for delivery on the rural routes the following morning. We are obliged to transport the papers in our own cars.

Most newspapers including the Journal would have no objection to increased postal rates if we could be assured of adequate service. For a daily newspaper time is of the essence and as things stand now the postal service is almost useless.

I hope Congress will not allow itself to be bluffed by the postmaster general's recent curtailment of service. They may be curtailing the service but I haven't noticed any curtailment in the amount of help the post office is using.

Constructive suggestions. Fire every postmaster in the country and turn the service over to a private corporation like the A. T. & T. to operate. We'll have better service, rates will be lowered, and the corporation will operate at a profit.

Cordially yours,

MARK P. HAINES.

THE GREED OF A FEW SHOULD NOT CAUSE ALL TO SUFFER

Mr. Speaker, it is the imperative duty of the Congress without delay to curb the arbitrary action of a union which by a strike impairs public health, safety or welfare, or injuriously affects the economic life of a community.

Conceding that employees have the right to bargain collectively and to strike, that right, like every other right, is subject to the limitation that, in exercising it, the public welfare shall not be threatened or impaired.

Labor unions have grown powerful because the Congress conferred upon them and their members special benefits and powers.

To attain benefits to which they were not entitled, some unions have exercised arbitrary power to the detriment of the rest of us.

The latest illustration of the exercise of that arbitrary power is the strike of the railroad firemen, who now demand the employment of an unnecessary third man, another fireman, on Diesel engines, even though the railroads have no need for that man's services, and, two fact-finding boards of the President have so declared.

Not only would the employment of the second unnecessary fireman add to the cost of transportation, to which all must contribute, but it would establish a precedent for the employment of other unneeded workers.

The effect of this strike is widespread. Yesterday's mail brought many protests from California; the morning brought me letters and wires from Michigan, and the morning press indicates the widespread tie-up, not only of express, of perishable freight, but of the mail.

The remedy for this present situation and for strikes which injuriously and unfairly affect the rights of the individuals of communities throughout the country is simple and apparent.

Only because unions have been granted special privileges by exemptions granted them under the antitrust laws, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and because of the special privileges given them by the Taft-Hartley Act, and by other legislation designed to benefit labor, are they now able to ignore the rights of the

public, enforce their will, their demands, upon all.

I would not attempt by law to force any man contrary to his wishes to work at any job. I would not attempt to restrain any man from quitting a job for any reason or for no reason at all. I would not attempt to deny a man or an organization the right to strike.

But when an individual or an organization misuses the special benefits and privileges granted by laws enacted for the benefit of the worker or for a labor organization, I would withdraw those special rights, those special privileges, so granted.

If a son, for whom I had purchased and to whom I had given a high-powered, speedy automobile insisted upon driving that car recklessly down the highway, endangering the safety of others who might be using it, I would take that car from him. So, too, I would, by law, take from the worker, from the union, the privileges and special benefits given to them, when they, arbitrarily, and to the injury of others, misuse those special powers.

Today a bill was introduced by me which offers that simple and clear remedy. It inflicts no penalty upon the union which calls a strike, upon the employee who engages in a strike or who walks the picket line.

It does, however, when he misuses the power which the Congress has given him, take from him those special benefits and privileges heretofore granted.

What could be more simple? What could be more effective? What could be more fair?

Will the Congress act now? Or are we fearful of incurring the political wrath of the unions?

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MISS DOROTHY SHAVER

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, last week the French Ambassador presented the Cross of the Chevalier of the Legion of Honor to America's most outstanding career woman, Miss Dorothy Shaver, president of New York's Lord & Taylor. She was commended for her service to "French art and French fashion in the United States." During the war Miss Shaver served as a director of American Relief for France.

It is my pleasure to be a friend of the Shaver family. I have personally known and been closely associated with the Shavers for years; they have lived for generations in the district I have the honor to represent. Her father, Hon. James D. Shaver, a prominent lawyer and outstanding judge, has distinguished himself as one of the State's best known and most respected jurists. He has been a great inspiration to me; he lives now with his son, Ben, who is known throughout the State of Arkansas for his legal ability and performance at the bar. Her other brother, Jim, is a very successful abstractor and real-estate man. In her pursuits, Miss Shaver has been encouraged and supported by her sister, Elsie.

Dorothy Shaver's success is due to a personality of opposites. Her father's

family of lawyers gave her a tough masculine mind; her mother's family of artists a highly feminine creative touch. In her 27 years at Lord & Taylor's she has used both to advantage. She is accomplished, patient, tolerant, and well informed.

The path Dorothy Shaver has traveled and the fame she has acclaimed are worthy of emulation and are expressive of the opportunities that exist in our United States. Miss Shaver was born in the little town of Center Point, Ark.; was educated in the public schools of Mena, Ark., and the University of Arkansas. She then studied art with her sister, Elsie, at the University of Chicago. Then the two sisters went to New York. Dorothy suggested to Elsie that she design a doll for commercial sale. "It could make us a fortune," she thought. Elsie designed and created five little dolls, which they called the Five Little Shavers. The New Yorkers were impressed; women carried the dolls under their arms as mascots. The sisters had opened a shop, Elsie designing and Dorothy managing. Lord & Taylor beckoned for Dorothy, and there, 27 years ago, Dorothy began her phenomenal rise to success. Yes; it is an admirable story of success and one exemplary of our American way of life.

The people of the Wonder State of Arkansas—the land of opportunity—point with pride to the unusual accomplishments and outstanding achievements of this great woman—the first female to head a \$30,000,000 corporation.

Her ideas and innovations in advertising and merchandising have been widely effective. She is credited with being largely responsible for securing recognition for American designing talent. She has discovered and developed more than 75 native designers in the field of fashion and decoration.

In 1924 Dorothy Shaver joined Lord & Taylor's staff to reorganize the comparison shopping bureau. A year later she suggested the establishment of a bureau of fashion advisers and then proceeded to organize the first bureau of stylists in an American department store now an essential part of this business.

In recognition of her ability, Miss Shaver was made a member of the board of directors of the company in 1927. By 1931 she was a vice president of the company, with an expanding influence in retail sphere. From 1937 until her promotion in 1945 the executive was first vice president, charged with handling the advertising, fashion promotion, public relations and display programs of the store.

During World War II she applied her knowledge of merchandising to the war effort in her service as general consultant to the Office of Quartermaster General.

In late 1945, by her election to the presidency of Lord & Taylor, the career woman again established a precedent—the first woman to head a department store this size, she succeeded Walter Hoving at a significant time in the history of the New York store. The corporation has a broad postwar expansion plan—

the erection of a new building on Fifth Avenue between Fifty-second and Fifty-third Street, and additional suburban branches. In May 1946 Miss Shaver was elected a director of the Associated Dry Goods Corp., the parent organization with which Lord & Taylor is affiliated.

Miss Shaver has crossed the Atlantic often, establishing merchandising markets in Europe. She has been described as a woman sizzling with ideas, not only about design, but about politics and the world in general.

WOMEN RUN THE RASCALS OUT OF GARY

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, this being Monday and the day following Mother's Day, I feel that what I am going to say here today is truly a genuine tribute to mothers on the day dedicated to them, although I cannot feel that they should be subjected to the embarrassment and humiliation of having to take the actions that are described in the article that I am including with my address. I still feel that this address is a tribute to them, and I want to say that I feel that under the circumstances, as described therein, it is necessary for them to take this sort of action if they are to rid their towns and cities of such intolerable conditions.

What a disgrace. It certainly is an indictment of those men who have been elected or come to public office and are entrusted with the enforcement of good laws. By their actions they destroy the value of fine principles and wise laws which have been put on the statute books over the period of years by the duly elected representatives of the majority of the people—those who wanted protection from this sort of thing and who sincerely desired to safeguard their homes and families. Men without integrity have no place in public office and will all too often sell their honor and public trust for the proverbial thirty pieces of silver.

This tribute may be somewhat different from the usual ones on this beautiful day when mostly we speak with flowery words of tender love, appreciation, and adoration. I like those speeches and enjoy hearing those wonderful words with the sincerely beautiful sentiments they convey. And it is with deep regret that I admit that they are all too quickly forgotten by those men and women who so ruthlessly succeed in bringing pain to the hearts of many of those same mothers who only a day or two before had been the recipients of flowers, candy, greeting cards, and many other tokens of love and admiration.

These mothers whose husbands and sons have fought in World Wars I and II need only the blooming of the poppies in Flanders Field, and tiny crosses on Okinawa to remind them that they are mothers. Mothers whose kin fought so valiantly to abolish greed and avarice, the two causes of vice and corruption, that they might have a more decent world for them to live in. And, now they

themselves must take up banners instead of guns and form picket lines in the streets and alleys where they are abused and insulted. The noble instinct of motherhood ever within their breast will cause them to make these sacrifices to preserve for themselves, their children and their children's children, that finest heritage, the quality of decency in living and in government.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Members of the House last Thursday upon the subject of economy in Government, I called their attention to the fact that ECA money was being used in France to rehabilitate a gambling casino. This I am definitely opposed to for the many reasons I gave in those remarks. Necessarily, I made direct reference to this situation as it affects our own citizens in the various communities in which they live. Because of the great amount of money the Congress is spending in investigating this subject on a nationwide basis and with the questionable results of this investigation and the effectiveness of any possible resultant legislation that may be enacted, I take the privilege of suggesting what seems to me a more direct and effectual method of combating this problem.

I believe the article taken from the May issue of the American magazine will demonstrate clearly what I mean. The people of any community must take a greater interest in its civic affairs. They have more power in their hands than any lawmakers. The forces for right and decency are more potent than mere laws. The power of an aroused public opinion, aided by exposés by the various news services can do an effective job. Where there is a will there is a way.

It is hardly possible to legislate morals. May I remind you of the complete failure of the prohibition law. Education and a strengthening of our national morality are the answers, in my opinion. Our churches have long been a potent force in such situations, along with our many civic and service clubs and organizations. They must further stimulate their members to the never-ending task that seems to be everlastingly confronting them.

The church in America has long had the tradition of being nonpolitical, and rightly so, but does any honest citizen, or worshiper, feel that because his church is nonpolitical it therefore should not point out the road to civic virtue. Does any one feel that all ministers should hold their peace in the face of political tyranny or corruption? No, indeed. The many large and highly respected fraternal organizations whose very foundations are based upon the highest of ideals and the noblest precepts will be willing partners in such a cause. And, last but not least the women of America, as you will see when you read the following article, are and always have been, in my opinion, the strongest force of all for decency. They will do any job they set their minds and hearts to do.

It is indeed encouraging to me that more and more of our citizens are taking an increasing interest in the affairs of their Government. It is hoped that all people will realize that they have responsibilities as well as privileges, and they

must take a more active part if they are to help shape the policies their representatives adopt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to clutter up the Record with inconsequential material and I am sure that the Members will agree that there is a serious and grave situation existing, such as I have outlined, from coast to coast. And, with desperate appeals coming to the Federal Government from cities like Los Angeles for Federal help, we must take immediate stock of our resources to solve the problems. Then let us go further than just finding the prevention. Let us discover the causes of crime and corruption and work for the elimination of them.

And, lastly let us not forget the importance of the ballot box in electing men and women of honor and integrity to public office.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my own remarks upon this subject and before the inclusion of the magazine article I referred to I would like to take a brief second to make an observation about my speech Thursday to the House.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] made a rather lusty speech here this afternoon in regard to this matter of spending ECA money for the gambling casino in Le Havre, France. I am glad to know that the gentleman took notice of the remarks I made on Thursday where I called it to the attention of the House. It also pleases me that Members of the other body, the Senate, likewise took notice of my address and said so in their remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article from the American magazine.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WOMEN RUN THE RASCALS OUT OF GARY
(By Edwin T. Connell)

After a first-hand look into the civic house-cleaning that has taken place in Gary, Ind., during the past year, I am convinced that if you want your town cleaned up, just turn the job over to the women.

Hold your fire, men. Don't shoot—yet. I used to think politics was a man's world, too. But now—well, see for yourself.

A little over a year ago, Gary, a key industrial city of some 140,000, had the dubious distinction of being one of the worst communities in the Nation. National surveys showed it to be the country's second crime center and one of the top three in vice. The American Social Hygiene Association reported about 100 percent gain in organized vice activities in 4 years. Today, Gary has dropped down the odious list to a point where it is a fairly decent place in which to live.

In the first 8 weeks of 1949, there were eight brutal murders in Gary. In the next 10 months, there were only two.

As last year began brothels and bookie joints boomed. They didn't even bother to turn down the blinds. Today, the blinds are up and dust gathers on the gaming tables and fancy furnishings of the fleshpots.

Fifteen months ago, women either did not dare go out alone at night in Gary or, when they did, many carried guns and knives for protection. Now, once again, they are able to attend their church and club meetings unarmed and without fear for their lives and property.

What happened?

In a year 10,000 stout-hearted and determined women literally forced decency upon their city. They had tired of men's excuses that a gigantic vice syndicate had the politicians and police by the throat and nothing could be done. They defied a multi-million-dollar syndicate. Two thousand women stormed city hall in a body. They picketed brothels and joints. They ignored threats. They poked indignant fingers into every phase of city government. And they got results. They got results that any crime- and vice-ridden city can get if the citizens have the spirit and resolve of the petticoat vigilantes of Gary.

What actually called these women to arms was the brutal slaying of a revered member of their own sex. On the night of March 3, 1929, Miss Mary Cheever, a beloved 45-year-old language teacher, was shot and killed in an alley near her home, when she apparently resisted a purse snatcher. Miss Cheever had been returning from a PTA meeting, where she had lectured on her travels in South America. She had just parked her car and was about to enter her apartment building, when the murderer grabbed her. He escaped, and has never been caught.

The tragic news spread like a forest fire over the city, gathering heat as it went. Lights burned late that night. Telephone wires hummed. Miss Cheever had taught many of Gary's young matrons. She was now teaching some of their children. She had been active in civic and church affairs. She typified the best in Gary, or any city. But now she was dead, brutally and wantonly murdered by a desperate thug in the shadow of her own home. It could have happened to any woman.

Among the many phone conversations that night was one between two women, who were not only struck with grief, but fired to action. One of them said, "This is too much. None of us is safe. Let's do something." The other replied, "All right; let's."

With those few words one of the most amazing crusades in American history was launched. The identity of the woman who made the original suggestion has never been revealed. Her colleagues, contrary to the traditions of their sex, have kept it a closely guarded secret, fearing reprisals if the identity of the modern Joan of Arc becomes known.

These two women agreed to call some friends. Their friends called other friends, and on a Sunday afternoon, 3 days after Miss Cheever's death, 21 women met in the YMCA consultation room. Their purpose was to draw up a resolution to the city council demanding that an outside investigator be brought in to clean up the city, and also an immediate increase in the number of police. These women were housewives, teachers, businesswomen. Many nationalities were represented. There were Negroes and whites; Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; Republicans and Democrats. Most of them didn't know one another. In fact, they had only two things in common—each was a leader in some woman's group, and they were all blazing mad.

In a 7-hour session—they worked right through dinner—they drew up a resolution, and decided to call a mass meeting of Gary's women for the next night to present it. They didn't even wait for some time to build up interest, or to give people a chance to arrange personal affairs. On Monday, an announcement appeared in the Gary Post-Tribune, the town's only daily newspaper, calling the meeting.

That night, although it was a cold, raw March evening, over 2,000 angry women packed Seaman Hall and unanimously approved the resolution. The tone of the meeting was set by Mrs. Russell T. Griffith, young wife of a chemical engineer and assistant

director of the Gary Symphony Orchestra, who said, "If the city officials won't protect us, we woman can—and will." Someone pointed out that the city council was meeting in city hall at that very moment. "Let's present this resolution to the council in person," said another. The "ayes" shook the rafters.

And so, bundling into their furs and their cloth coats, the entire body of 2,000 women marched with dignity and determination down Broadway—Gary's main street—and literally stormed city hall. There were no shouts, screams, or demonstrations of any kind. Of course, only a few got inside, but the others waited silently on the winding stairs of the city hall rotunda and swelled out onto the street.

Inside the packed city council chamber, Mrs. Benjamin Saks, a former English teacher, read the resolution in a small but firm voice demanding that Arthur M. Thurston, superintendent of the Indiana State Police, be called in to investigate Gary, and that more police be added. Mayor Eugene Swartz happened to be present at the meeting and, since this was really his responsibility, the president of the council asked him for comment.

"I have always tried to give this community exactly what it wanted," said the mayor. "If this town wants gambling cleaned up, it can have it. We'll clean it from top to bottom, from one end to the other. And I shall not ask for more police to do the job, not right now, anyway. If that's what you people want, that's what you're going to get."

That's what the women wanted, but not all. The mayor said the city could not afford more police at that time, and the women came back with figures showing that other cities of the same size as Gary had more police protection on a lower budget than their city. They were not impressed, either, by promises of a shut-down of gambling. They'd had them before, especially around election time, when opposing candidates and the newspapers would scream about vice. The word would simply go out over the underworld to lay low for a while. Once the election was safely passed, the vice joints were wide open again.

The women kept pounding the mayor with questions and demands, and finally, when it was nearly midnight, the women allowed the meeting to adjourn after they had given Mayor Swartz 2 weeks to do something, and he had promised action.

Well, the next day you couldn't place a bet, play a slot machine, or find an operating brothel in Gary. But as yet no one was really taking the women seriously. This was just a new variation of one of the periodic reforms that blossom up overnight and die as quickly. The syndicate had been through it a dozen times.

To give you some idea of what the women were up against, perhaps I had better fill you in with a brief background picture of Gary. It is a young city, founded in 1906 by United States Steel, and is the home of the Nation's largest steel works. It is built on a sand dune on the shores of Lake Michigan. An almost unbroken rim of steel mills stretches along the water front. Fire and smoke belch from blast furnaces around the clock.

It is a lusty town, with more men than women. They work hard and they play hard. There are no real old families in Gary and, consequently, it is only now, when a second generation has grown up, that a civic pride is developing. Gary is also plagued by migratory workers. These men are on the loose. They make good money and spend it. Gambling houses, bars, and brothels make it easy spending. Gary is 27 percent Negro and has a large foreign population. One section of town called the central district has about the most shocking living conditions you'll find anywhere.

Vice in Gary had been organized into a smooth-running machine. Gary and nearby Chicago newspapers repeatedly charged that the town was run by the syndicate; that some of the politicians and police were paid off regularly. There were repeated reports, too, revealing how politicians had prospered in office and police officials were able to live far beyond their salaries. Vice was a \$5,000,000-a-year business. It was not going to retire from business without a struggle.

Consequently, no one was surprised, least of all the women, who were learning about their town fast, when at the end of 2 weeks nothing had happened other than the closing of the joints. Completely ignored had been the demand for an outside investigator to study Gary's vice and crime problem and put into effect permanent reforms; also, no steps had been taken to increase the number of police. Once again, the women called a mass meeting, and, as before, packed Seaman Hall with 2,000. They sent a committee to the mayor to get a report. Then, restless over waiting, they decided to march again. Another 2,000 paraded in the rain down to city hall. They learned that the mayor was out of town.

"This is a stall," concluded the women. "All right," they said; "we'll go to the Governor."

Their leaders called Indianapolis and made an appointment with Gov. Henry F. Schricker for later that week. Into the State Capitol, in the vanguard of the descending women, poured bushels of letters and telegrams from the chamber of commerce, civic and church groups, business and professional men who carried weight and, more important, votes, all stating they were behind the women 100 percent.

When 18 delegates of the women's army arrived in Indianapolis, Governor Schricker agreed to give them 15 minutes. The women told me that at first the Governor was merely polite to the nice ladies who had come all the way to the Capitol to see him. He was glad of their interest in government. But when they let it be known they were not just sight-seeing and began bombarding him with questions and demands that he send State Police Superintendent Thurston to Gary to clean up the city, he grew angry.

Mrs. Griffith told me that at one point Governor Schricker said the demonstration by the women was a Republican trick to embarrass his Democratic administration. Mrs. Saks, who had read the original resolution at the city council, wiggled a finger at the Governor, and said, "I'm probably a better Democrat than you are, Governor." Finally, the Governor agreed to do something and said he would send Thurston, if invited by Mayor Swartz. The original 15-minute hand-shaking session had lasted 4 hours.

The 18 women rushed back to Gary to report and wait. Thurston did come to Gary, but, according to the women, he made only a visiting-fireman's tour of the town and left.

The women decided they must dig in for a long fight. They made their organization a permanent one, and had it incorporated under the name of the Women's Citizens Committee. They decided, one night, they must have some money. The next day they had charter membership cards printed. They gave the cards out to women in bunches, not even bothering to count how many were given to each. They went from door to door for contributions, and 2 weeks later had over \$16,000.

Membership in the WCC grew to 10,000. The greatest interest came from the poor sections, where these people were heartened by the fact that for the first time someone was paying attention to them. The women formed a Crime Commission comprised of 65 members of the leading men's citizen groups and the 21 original members of the women's

group, who became the advisory committee. It was to study the police.

A committee of women called upon Mayor Swartz and told him flatly they would keep up their demonstrations until the city was cleaned up permanently. Although ostensibly the places of vice were closed, there was evidence of lots of cheating and, if you were known, you could get just about anything you wanted. The syndicate was gradually inching its way back into business as usual, as it had so often in the past.

However, the continued persistence of the women had made it evident to the administration that it had more than a flash-in-the-pan nuisance on its hands, and the first concrete step was taken. The mayor did some reshuffling in the police department, created a new vice squad and placed Capt. Peter Billick at the head.

Billick had a long and honorable record. He worked closely with the FBI during the war. Police in Gary are civil service, and Billick had no fear of losing his job. Given the green light by the mayor as a result of the women's pressure, Billick and his squad swung into action. They raided brothels, gambling houses, bookie joints, and unsavory taverns; made arrests by the score.

The women did their part by opening a post office box No. 569 and invited citizens to give them tips of where the law was being violated. Information poured in, and Billick acted on it.

But the syndicate was not yet licked. It was annoyed because all this was costing money, but was far from beaten. All the syndicate did was fall back on the courts. As fast as cases came up in court, they would, almost invariably, be dismissed. When one of the gambling or prostitute cases came up in city court, a special judge would be requested by the attorney for the defense, and the request would be granted. This is permissible under Indiana law. The special judge was merely a local Gary lawyer.

According to Captain Billick, it was a common occurrence that on a certain day this lawyer would sit in judgment on a case involving a madam of one of the brothels and would dismiss the case. The very next day, this same lawyer would be defense attorney for another madam, and the lawyer for the defense on the previous day would be the special judge. He, too, would dismiss the case for his colleague.

Billick told me that every imaginable dodge was used. Warrants were declared faulty or there were no warrants. Evidence was insufficient. If an outright dismissal was too bald, the case would be continued and Billick would lose his witnesses. The syndicate fought a delaying action. The whole purpose was to discourage the police and the women. But Billick kept at it. He said he got at least the satisfaction that he was costing the vice boys money, at least \$100 for each arrest. Over a period of 7 months, Billick arrested about 1,000 persons, which adds up to \$100,000.

Well, the weeks of spring came and went, and soon it was summer. The weather became stifling. Many of the WCC leaders were away on trips. Others, with their children home all day from school, had little time for meetings. The WCC seemed to be dying of the heat. Billick himself took a vacation. While he was away, the underworld boys set the grapevine buzzing with the news that the "lid is off." Back in business went the gamblers and the madams.

It was at this point that the women struck their most dramatic and telling blow of all. The advisory committee held a special and very secret session. Mrs. Griffith was chairman of the committee at the time.

At this special meeting, the advisory committee decided something had to be done, or the WCC would fold. They called a meeting of the steering committee for the next night

to disclose their plan. This group is made up of some 300 women, who are the heads of Gary's clubs and organizations. It is through this committee that the 10,000 women are held together. A notice to the steering committee was published in the paper. No information as to the purpose of the meeting was given except that it was important. Mrs. Griffith said she did not know whether anyone would respond, and a small hall at the YMCA was used. Over 100 women responded and there were not enough seats. Then Mrs. Griffith disclosed the new strategy.

"I told those women," Mrs. Griffith now recalls, "that it was obvious that arrests were not bringing results. Places were still operating. The politicians said there was no vice in Gary. Our tips had proved that not to be true. Then I said it was the wish of the advisory committee that the women of Gary go out and stand in front of the known places of vice and gambling, wearing identifying arm bands which we had made, and observe and report any illicit activity."

"Much to our amazement, practically all the women agreed to the plan. In no time, we had over 160 volunteers. What we called at the start, observing, was immediately dubbed picketing. It makes no difference what it was called; it worked."

For the next 2 days Gary was treated to what was probably one of the most unusual sights in American history. Working in 2-hour shifts from 10 a. m. until 8 p. m. these resolute 160 women picketed. They picketed only in the daytime for safety's sake, but since Gary is a three-shift working town and men are free at odd hours, day is the same as night as far as gambling and vice are concerned. There were 2 to 10 women picketing at each place, depending upon the size. They watched front and back doors. They wore their WCC arm bands and carried pencils and pads. They went right down into the worst section of Gary, the central district.

They stood in the broiling sun and observed. They took down the license number of every car that stopped. They jotted down the names of the men they knew as they entered a place, or the names of men given to them by woman residents of the section, who were in sympathy with the demonstration. Needless to say, this hurt business. In addition to the brothels, they picketed cigar stores, poolrooms, barbershops, and cafes where it was known you could make a bet. Even a man bent on an innocent game of pool or a haircut would not dare go past the picket line of women.

Baby-sitters did a land-office business as the fighting women left their homes and children to picket. Dishes piled up in sinks, and houses remained undusted. The women withstood jeers and threats from the gamblers and catcalls from the madams and prostitutes, who shouted and cursed at them from behind shutters, and even spit upon them.

The demonstration was not without its amusing side. One of the better-type bookie joints provided chairs for the women on the sidewalk, another offered soft drinks and even invited the women in for lunch. "We've got air-conditioning," the operator gave as his lure. One enterprising operator said he'd give the women a "sure thing" at Arlington, if they'd leave him alone. The women resisted all temptations.

However, one bookie became so incensed that he pulled up the awning in front of his joint and forced the women to stand in the broiling sun. They stood.

Well, 2 days of this and the vice boys were ready to cry "Uncle!" They headed for cover again. Taking the cue from the women, Billick, having returned from his vacation, abandoned the policy of concentrating on evidence and arrests and began a systematic program of harassment. He had policemen stationed in the bookie joints. The prosti-

tutes began leaving town in droves, and some were picked up for soliciting as far away as Indianapolis. "Gary's too hot," was their lament.

Billick began systematic raids in three shifts. He would hit one place several times a day and night; other places night after night. The gamblers tried to alert one another, but Billick varied his raids. They didn't know where he'd strike next.

The leaders of the WCC received dire threats. Mrs. Griffith was told several times over the phone that she would be killed. She laughed them off. "We're too strong," she said. "They wouldn't dare." One woman was told that if she picketed she was stepping "on a bunch of eggs and was asking for the undertaker." She picketed. The husband of one of the women, an attorney, told me that a politician cautioned him to quiet his wife down or there would be trouble. The lawyer replied, "I've been trying to quiet her for 15 years. If you think you can do it, you have my blessing."

Secretly, the men are very proud of their pioneering mates. It stands to reason that most of the women would not be able to continue unless the men gave their tacit approval. The women have gone in where the men had long feared to tread. The husbands also had wanted reform, but had always hesitated. They had their businesses to think about. They knew that men had been beaten and even murdered because they had gotten in the way of the vice lords. The men considered the dangers; the women ignored them.

For the 6 months that Billick kept up his harassment, Gary was closed tight as a drum as far as organized vice was concerned. Mayor Swartz brought in the investigator the women were demanding. He was Donald K. Kookan, of Chicago, and he made several recommendations for improving the police set-up. The women, meanwhile, branched out into many phases of government—housing, legislation, taxation, traffic, courts, education.

When the lid first came down on vice in Gary, the vice boys tried to move their places just outside the city limits. But the petticoat army was right behind them. One day the women spotted trucks carrying gambling equipment to a large house in the county. They also knew that Governor Schricker was attending a luncheon in a nearby town. The women got into cars, tracked down the Governor, and informed him that State highways were being used to transport gambling equipment and he had better put a stop to it. The place never opened.

Along about the first of this year, with the women immersed in long-range reforms, the vice boys made another bid for return. Billick was removed from his assignment and put in charge of records. This looked as though he were being shelved. Five new captains were appointed and the work was divided. There was to be no vice squad and each officer was responsible for any vice or gambling on his beat. This was in accordance with the recommendations of investigator Kookan, and since the women had asked for such an investigation, they said nothing. But they watched.

The vice boys, however, took the changes to mean the light was again green for them. It was going to be a happy new year. Well, it was the shortest happy new year on record. Five days after 1950 made its bow and Gary commenced coming to life again as a pleasure town, the women sighted their guns. They went on the radio; they made statements in the papers; they warned the mayor and the chief of police; "We'll march again; we'll picket again." That was enough. The lid went back down, and there it remains as this is being written.

According to Gary police officials, gambling has been cut down at least 60 percent

during the past year. There is still some gambling in private clubs, and policy wheels operate on the sly, but I was informed that revenue from policy had dropped from \$6,000 or \$7,000 per week to between \$300 and \$400 a week.

Everybody I talked to, both men and women, agreed that organized vice and gambling were licked in Gary. In addition to the fact that murders had dropped from one a week for 2 months to two murders in 10 months, police records show a great reduction in purse-snatching, housebreaking, and other crimes. This, despite the fact that Gary had a 7-week strike late last year in the steel plant and such a condition has, in the past, resulted in an increase in crime. The women of Gary no longer fear to walk the streets after dark.

Most astounding of all, not only to the politicians but to the husbands of the crusading women, is not so much what they have done, as the fact that they keep doing it. They have more enthusiasm now than when they started.

The women know that they have not completely licked the problem. You can still make a sly bet in Gary. I saw some bets being taken while I was there. Taxicabs do a thriving business in finding girls for men who are so minded. Some of the taverns have an unusually large number of female customers at the bar, and a male customer will not be snubbed if he opens a conversation. Nor will he be disappointed if he suggests a date. The women are the first to tell you all this and say they hope to largely eliminate it in time. They know you can't legislate morals. Their major pride is in the fact that they have reduced vice to a catch-as-catch-can status and have slain the dragon syndicate.

They've been called Carrie Nations and petticoat crusaders and they renounce any connection. They regard themselves, instead, as normal American citizens, who want a decent city in which to live. Like their pioneer forebears, they'll fight for it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MILITARY PROVISION IN H. R. 7797

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that I have been here all day, and only because of urgent and important business in my office did I miss the first quorum call, No. 164.

Mr. Speaker, a matter that I feel is important as far as unemployment and employment are concerned is the matter of the deletion of the 12½ percent milling provision in the bill H. R. 7797. I have a letter here from the American Federation of Grain Millers which I would like to insert in the RECORD along with my remarks.

The first paragraph of this letter reads:

We would appreciate your support in obtaining an amendment to House bill H. R. 7797. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has deleted the provision in this bill which provides that 12½ percent of all wheat grants under the ECA be in the form of flour. It is important to us that this provision be incorporated in the new bill.

I will read the first few lines of my wire to him:

Regarding milling provision in H. R. 7797. We had been informed by members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that it had been retained and we had nothing to worry about. However, I have just now discovered that contrary to our previous assurance it has been deleted in House and Senate joint conference.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is really important that we take another look at

this ECA program. The people here have to work, they have to have employment if they are going to furnish the money for such program. After all, 12½ percent is only one-eighth, which means only one bag of flour out of eight that goes to Europe would be milled in this country.

The millers themselves, the owners, want this provision, the employees need it. They are down to 4 days a week, and they will be down to three before long. They cannot live on that kind of take-home pay.

There is also involved the question of exports. Between 1920 and 1930 the mills in this country were exporting from 27 to 30 percent of all the flour to foreign countries. A question has been raised by testimony in the committee that Britain, for instance, does not want the kind of flour we mill. They say it is too fine, or something of that kind. May I say that if they could use it from 1920 to 1930 they can use it now and I should think they would be glad to get it and let us have a little employment for our people over here. They claim that is the reason they buy wheat from Canada, but it looks rather peculiar to me that we who send our money to foreign countries and have them turn around and buy everything they need from other countries besides us. It seems to me that out of gratitude or from some other feeling they would not always require that we give up everything. If we are going to send everything to Europe in that fashion, why do we not send our steel over there and let them manufacture their own tractors, automobiles, and so forth? We have unemployment in this country and it is a situation we should be considering.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, if we send our steel over there and let them manufacture automobiles and fabricate all the rest of those things, there will be more people out of work. The gentleman said something about their buying things from us. They cannot buy anything unless we give them the money and does not the gentleman realize what a wonderful profit there is in those transactions?

Mr. IRVING. I am not promoting the idea of our sending steel over there; they have steel already over there, but if we follow that basic policy, let us follow it all the way through.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I cannot yield further. Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have a very short simple question.

Mr. IRVING. The gentleman's questions are always simple, like who killed cock robin, or something of that nature.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It would be interesting to find out who did kill him.

Mr. IRVING. Or what did the Governor of South Carolina say to the Governor of North Carolina.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He said, "Let's have a drink."

Mr. IRVING. It is questions like that which are only injected to confuse the speaker and for dilatory tactics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thought the gentleman would quit.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri does not quit. He does not care to waste his time or the time of the House or the taxpayers' money in any such nonsense. Nor does he think the people of this Nation approve of the delaying and dilatory tactics that were used here today by those on the left side of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. ENGLE of California, for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. MAGEE, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. FELLOWS), for an indefinite period, on account of death in family.

To Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. McCORMICK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. WELCH, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3258. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 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:

1445. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a request to repeal section 9 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (Public Law 110, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1446. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain persons to accept and wear decorations bestowed upon them by certain foreign countries"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1447. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the acts of the first special session of the Seventeenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, August 29 to September 11, 1949, pursuant to section 23 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, approved March 2, 1917; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1448. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1449. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 8, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Big South Fork River and tributaries, Tennessee, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. TACKETT: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1739. An act to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, and House Resolution 107, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6209. A bill to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6319. A bill to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 8199. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act of May 25, 1948 (Public Law 554, 80th Cong.) relating to the Flathead Indian irrigation project; with amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1959. An act to commemorate Jim White and his contribution to the early history of Carlsbad Caverns, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2117. An act to provide for the designation of the reservoir to be formed by the Davis Dam on the Colorado River as Lake Mohave; without amendment (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. Senate Concurrent Resolution 64. Concurrent resolution requesting burial in Arlington National Cemetery of the last surviving member of the Grand Army of the Republic upon his death; with amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 8502. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives and to reorganize the executive departments of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 8503. A bill to provide a reimbursement for uniforms and equipment for officers of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8504. A bill to authorize payment of death gratuity on account of death in active or training service of personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, including the Reserve components of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 8505. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILLMER:

H. R. 8506. A bill to provide for the construction of the Markhams Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 8507. A bill to protect the public health and economic welfare of the States and the subdivisions thereof and of the people thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8508. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 8509. A bill to provide for a national agricultural policy to be carried out on a self-sustaining basis, and to promote conservation and development of the Nation's soil resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 8510. A bill to authorize revision of the procedures employed in the administration of certain trust funds administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 8511. A bill to amend and supplement section 3 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8512. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to extend financial assistance to private enterprise to promote the development, production, and utilization of taconite and other minerals advantageous to the national defense and the strengthening of the national economy, to promote free enterprise in the mineral-mining industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 8513. A bill to facilitate the conservation of wildlife and the preservation of natural features by providing a Nature Conservancy of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 8514. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 8515. A bill to amend the act of July 18, 1940, to provide an additional 1-year period in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army may make claims for benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8516. A bill authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system, and authorizing the United States to pay for water and water services secured from the water system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. J. Res. 469. Joint resolution to appropriate funds to combat serious infestations of bark and pine beetles; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. J. Res. 470. Joint resolution directing the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Air Coordinating Committee of the Department of Commerce to carefully investigate the so-called Rome Convention limiting payment arising out of ground accidents caused by overseas air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 471. Joint resolution to provide for the distribution by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities among certain flood victims; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 602. Resolution requesting the President to suspend his order closing the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital, at Van Nuys, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 603. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, concerning the importation of rubber and other products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting the abolition of the present partition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 8517. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 8518. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 8519. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archer C. Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 8520. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toshi Ishibashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8521. A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to Frank David Blackhoop and Thomas Blackhoop; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 8522. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Abraham Rough Surface and Samuel Rough Surface; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8523. A bill for the relief of Marianna Gantschnigg and Merle Richard Gantschnigg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 8524. A bill for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 8525. A bill for the relief of Lonnie Odell Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8526. A bill for the relief of A. D. Woods; 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:

2126. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Women's Club of Little Falls, N. J., opposing compulsory health insurance and favoring the voluntary approach and the preservation of free enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2127. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolution adopted by the West Central Minnesota Association of Life Underwriters and attested by Richard E. Melby, secretary, Fergus Falls, Minn., in opposition to the enactment of any legislation for the establishment of any system of compulsory health insurance and socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2128. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Fulton County, N. Y., unequivocally opposing proposed action of the State Department in encouraging imports of leather gloves from Europe by reducing present tariff rates thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2129. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by the Racine Taxpayers, Inc., Racine, Wis., that the Congress speedily enact into law Senate bills 2212 and 2213 and House bill 5775, relating to the obsolete methods of handling postal finance and the political appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2130. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Roger Bliss, city clerk, Oshkosh, Wis., requesting and urging passage of Senate bill 2166; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2131. Also, petition of Fred Schwarzkopf, city clerk, Bridgeport, Conn., requesting that the Common Council of the City of Bridge-

port, Conn., be placed on record as favoring the completion of the investigation now going on in the State Department concerning subversive activities, and also requesting that support be given to the Mundt-Nixon bill; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2132. Also, petition of Miss Agnes C. Tuttle and others, Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Bronx, N. Y., requesting that action be taken against the antitrust suit against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2133. Also, petition of Edwin C. M. Dickey, Washington, D. C., relative to case 197-MCS, from the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2134. Also, petition of Miles D. Kennedy, director, the American Legion National Legislative Commission, Washington, D. C., relative to House bill 6277, and requesting that they be placed on record as being opposed to any legislation granting to former members of the merchant marine any veterans' benefits or any benefits akin to those normally granted veterans for their rehabilitation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 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, may the hush of Thy presence move us in this hallowed moment to adoration; and may all other voices be stilled that Thine may be heard. We wait for Thy benediction that we may face whatever the day brings in the certainty of Thy guidance, in the glory of Thy service and in the solemn realization that we are indeed our brother's keeper.

Speak to us now, through the silence, and, ere duty lead us back to a noisy, crowded way, vouchsafe to our waiting hearts assurance of forgiveness, of cleansing, of empowering, that as servants of Thine and of the people we may the more worthily serve this great day, when the hearts of men are stirring with the throb of deep desire for more abundant life. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 15, 1950, was dispensed with.

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 the bill (S. 2811) to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills,