

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JUNE 30, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1950, to June 30, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Victor P. Dalmas.....	Executive director..	\$5,422.98
Mildred Deen.....	Stenographer.....	1,888.86
Otis H. Ellis.....	Special counsel for petroleum (part time).....	2,714.46
Richard R. Haas.....	Research assistant... (May 1 to 15).....	1,806.82
Rowan F. Howard.....	Special investigator (May 1 to 15).....	399.30
Inge Kaiser.....	Research assistant (Feb. 19 to May 15).....	1,171.96
Joseph W. Kaufman.....	Chief counsel.....	5,422.98
Eugene Kelly.....	Research assistant (Jan. 1 to Feb. 28).....	1,263.62
Arthur F. Lucas.....	Economist - consultant (various dates, Apr. 28 to June 30).....	525.00
LaVerne Maynard.....	Stenographer.....	2,106.12
Vernon A. Mund.....	Economist - consultant (June 12 to 30).....	425.00
Bertha A. Padgett.....	Secretary.....	2,424.78
Kathryn E. Smith.....	Chief clerk.....	2,605.80
Mary Nell Snow.....	Typist (June 29 and 30).....	14.46
Ann K. Yost.....	Stenographer (May 17 to 20).....	41.97
Walter Adams.....	Economist - consultant (June 26, 27, and 28).....	60.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		56,902.60
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1950.....		33,480.19
Total amount expended from Feb. 2, 1949, to June 30, 1950.....		90,382.79
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1950.....		59,617.21

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 25, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

O God our Father, in hours of confusion and anxiety we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee. In these hard bested and dangerous days we would find peace in the midst of the storm and cleansing for the baseness of our own hearts. In this hour of the Nation's peril, sober us with a solemn sense of personal responsibility, with the realization that Thy call to every man is to contribute to the world's good his own life, strong and clean, honest, trustworthy, and serviceable.

As the bugles sound for the defense of precious things that are dearer than life, out of the depths we cry unto Thee, Thou Kindly Light. Our anguished hearts leap the seas to that far-away land where this very hour our own are contending so gallantly against the pagan powers of darkness. We pray that a sense of Thy presence may gird them as today they face unnumbered foes and in the tomorrows, when the gathering might of freemen shall push back the flood of ruthless aggression. We ask this in the calming assurance that conquer we must,

"For our cause it is just;
And this be our motto:
In God do we trust."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 24, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 24, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2079) for the relief of Mrs. Lydia L. Smith.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6240. An act to authorize the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana; and
H. R. 6454. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Wednesday of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Labor and Public Works were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning where we left off on the last call, and including certain bills, the objection to which I understand has been withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the list of additional bills will be

printed in the RECORD at this point, indicating the calendar number and the bill number.

The list is as follows:

Calendar No. 1817, S. 1800.
Calendar No. 1829, H. R. 1697.
Calendar No. 1833, S. 3245.
Calendar No. 1834, S. 2484.
Calendar No. 1835, S. 2786.
Calendar No. 1837, S. 3109.
Calendar No. 1838, S. 3244.
Calendar No. 1839, S. 3246.
Calendar No. 1840, S. 3687.
Calendar No. 1843, S. 3682.
Calendar No. 1844, H. R. 7265.
Calendar No. 1845, H. R. 4390.
Calendar No. 747, S. 1837.
Calendar No. 795, S. 2294.
Calendar No. 956, S. 17.
Calendar No. 968, H. R. 5647.
Calendar No. 1272, H. R. 1056.
Calendar No. 1596, H. R. 4653.
Calendar No. 1813, S. 1260.
Calendar No. 1744, H. R. 5372.
Calendar No. 1106, H. R. 4815.
Calendar No. 1696, S. 858.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there is no objection on the part of the minority to adding these bills to the call of measures to be called, to which there is no objection. Of course, any Senator has the right to object to the consideration of any bill. However, I wish to ask the acting majority leader whether it is his intention to resist or object to the consideration of any bill which was called and objected to previously, or am I to understand that no bills other than those to which there is no objection, including the list furnished this morning, may be considered?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have only asked for unanimous consent for a call of the calendar from where we left off the last time, and to include in the call this list of additional bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator refers to bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. Of course, any Senator may request unanimous consent at any time to take up other bills, to which any Senator, of course, may object.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 658)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a Report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from October 1, 1949, to March 31, 1950, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the

participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 25, 1950.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, and a confidential statistical supplement, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the war emergency has placed an undue amount of wear and burden upon the highways of the State of Washington because of the movement of army matériel and equipment; and

"Whereas Fort Lewis and other military reservations and airfields are situated in the State of Washington; and

"Whereas Fort Lewis is so situated that the movement of matériel and equipment to and from Fort Lewis results in an especially heavy amount of wear and strain upon the highways of the State of Washington; and

"Whereas much of such movement is in the form of excess weights over and beyond the legal weights established by law and have caused, are causing, and will continue to cause an undue amount of damage to the highways of the State of Washington; and

"Whereas the United States Government has in the past recognized such excess use and deterioration of the highways by making suitable allowances to compensate the State of Washington for such use and deterioration.

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States speedily take appropriate action to recompense the State of Washington for such wear and deterioration of its highways; and be it

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the house July 20, 1950.

"CHAS. W. HODGE,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate July 21, 1950.

"VICTOR A. MEYERS,
"President of the Senate.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Townsend Clubs of Pinellas County, at St. Petersburg, Fla., favoring the enactment of

the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mrs. Oda B. Thompson, of Collingdale, Pa., relating to her claim for compensation for certain inventions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TARIFF DUTY ON MOTORCYCLES AND PARTS—LETTER FROM WILLIAM H. BEYER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, cooperation and unity must be the order of the day at home and abroad in this present Korean crisis. Certainly never before has it been more essential that we coordinate our efforts with the British Commonwealth of Nations, and with our other western allies.

At the same time, however, it would be most unrealistic if we failed to appreciate the fact that the British are continuing to look after their interests insofar as domestic and foreign trade are concerned; and it is incumbent upon us to do likewise. Naturally, we want to promote world commerce; but at the same time, we must consider American living standards. I have in my hand a letter received from one of the many Wisconsin unions which have contacted me regarding the issue of reasonable protection of their jobs from further arbitrary slashes in tariff duties. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter which came from William H. Beyer, recording secretary of the Metal Polishers Union in Racine, Wis., be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the Record, because I think it is a typical "grass roots" expression on the tariff situation.

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

METAL POLISHERS, BUFFERS,
PLATERS AND HELPERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL No. 89,
Racine, Wis., July 12, 1950.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to the attention of our union that the present import duty on British motorcycles and parts is and has been much too low, and hence may have serious effects upon our future wage scale and working conditions.

Our standard of living must be maintained. Our wage scale must remain high and since there is a very small possibility of the costs of material coming down, it is with deep concern that we urge you to exert all possible pressure on the Tariff Commission and the State Department so that the present tariffs will be raised.

Competition is, of course, an American tradition, but since the standards of living here and in England are so vastly different, it is absolutely necessary that something be done.

Excessive imports at low rates of duty and based on devaluated currencies may jeopardize our jobs.

Any action you may take on this will be greatly appreciated by all the members of this union.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. BEYER,
Recording Secretary.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS—TELEGRAM AND RESOLUTIONS FROM NORTHEASTERN REGION OFFICIALS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unan-

imous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a telegram from Frank D. Merrill, commissioner, department of public works and highways, Concord, N. H., and five resolutions adopted by the conference of Northeastern Region Highway Officials, at New York City, relating to Federal aid to highways.

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

CONCORD, N. H., July 18, 1950.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am air mailing you resolutions special meeting Northeast Region State Highway Officials which are in effect a protest against further control by Federal Government on local matters pertaining to highways, as indicated by revised Senate highway bill. Resolutions 1 and 4 are more of interest to New Hampshire than others. Our feeling is basically we are concerned with all matters presented by Senate bill and concur on many points, but feel they are State problems which we can solve without supervision. New Hampshire last year paid in over \$4,000,000 in highway-user taxes and received back slightly over \$2,000,000. Cost of benevolent supervision seems rather high, and we can struggle along without more of it.

FRANK D. MERRILL,
Commissioner, Department of Public Works and Highways.

Resolution 1

Whereas the pending Federal aid highway legislation has established tentative formulas for the allocation of funds appropriated for highway purposes; and

Whereas it is to the interest of better Nation-wide highway transportation that such allocations be established in respect to predominant needs: Be it therefore

Resolved, That in the authorization of Federal aid highway funds, and in the allocation of such funds to the various States that the Congress of the United States give full consideration to the needs of the more populous States where the need for such highways is the greatest, the cost of construction is the highest, and where the traffic load is the heaviest; and be it further

Resolved, That the amendments proposed by the Senate of the United States, Committee of Public Works, to the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950, are utterly contrary to the transportation and highway needs of the Nation.

Resolution 2

Whereas lines 3 to 10 on page 20 of Senate committee print H. R. 7941, dated June 29, 1950, beginning with the words "In the use of funds," relates to matters which can only be resolved by engineering studies; and

Whereas the inclusion of such provisions in Federal aid highway legislation would result in endless red tape, confusion, and would improperly interfere in the States' rights to determine the best methods of meeting and providing for their respective traffic problems: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this section be not included in any Federal aid highway legislation to be considered and adopted by the Congress of the United States.

Resolution 3

Whereas the pending Federal-aid highway legislation contains a section referring to the construction of bypass routes and public hearings thereon; and

Whereas the matter of the construction of bypass highways is a problem which can only

be resolved after traffic investigation, together with engineering and economic studies, which could, if subjected to mandated public hearings, become adversely colored because of nontechnical considerations: Be it therefore

Resolved, That no Federal-aid highway legislation adopted by the Congress of the United States should mandate any State or Federal agency to hold public hearings in connection with the location, design, and construction of Federal-aid highways.

Resolution 4

Whereas legislative provisions for the authorization, allocation, and expenditure of Federal-aid funds for the improvement of secondary highways are of extreme importance to all States; and

Whereas the northeastern-region States highway officials have studied this matter diligently and have reached a unified conclusion as to the needs of their respective States in particular: Be it

Resolved, That the authorization, allocation, and expenditure of Federal-aid secondary-highway funds should be as provided in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended in 1948, and as set forth in H. R. 7941, and approved by the House of Representatives.

Resolution 5

Whereas Federal-aid highway legislation pending in the Senate contains provisions which if enacted would require the entry of Federal agencies into the organization and administration of State departments; and

Whereas such procedure would be an unwarranted interference with the inherent right of the various States to establish the internal workings of their own governmental agencies; and

Whereas it is impractical and undemocratic for the Federal Government, by Federal-aid legislation, to dictate the type of bureau or other agency that a State must establish within its highway or public-works department in order to become eligible for Federal aid: Be it

Resolved, That any provision, directly or indirectly giving the Federal Government additional controls over and above those already provided should be deleted from pending Federal-aid highway legislation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 5098. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; with amendments (Rept. No. 2153);

H. R. 6958. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Lee Edwards; with amendments (Rept. No. 2160);

H. R. 6963. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Guy L. Heckenlively; without amendment (Rept. No. 2154);

H. R. 6964. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Josephine Stevens Goering; without amendment (Rept. No. 2155);

H. R. 7017. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Edgar S. Bigman; with amendments (Rept. No. 2161);

H. R. 7293. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charlotte Gelsdorff Kibby; without amendment (Rept. No. 2156);

H. R. 7294. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to

Rebecca Collins Ross; without amendment (Rept. No. 2157); and

H. R. 7934. A bill to reduce and revise the boundaries of the Joshua Tree National Monument in the State of California, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2166).

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

H. R. 7439. A bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2158).

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

H. R. 4989. A bill to provide for the payment of just compensation to John H. Estate Limited, a Hawaiian corporation, for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2159).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 3862. A bill authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2165);

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the California World Progress Exposition; with amendments (Rept. No. 2162); and

H. J. Res. 453. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., August 7 through 20, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 2163).

NATIONAL MINERALS ACT OF 1950— REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report an original bill, to stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 2164) thereon.

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

The bill (S. 3972) to stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3963. A bill for the relief of Emma Pomeroy Von Lewinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 3964. A bill to amend the authority given the Secretary of the Interior by the act of June 25, 1947, to construct the Paonia reclamation project, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3965. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.;

S. 3966. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and

render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.; and

S. 3967. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3968. A bill to provide for the abatement of tax of certain trusts, the income and corpus of which are equitably owned by members of the Armed Forces who died on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations and prior to January 1, 1948; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3969. A bill for the relief of William Hoyt Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 3970. A bill for the relief of John S. Muratis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 3971. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original bill (S. 3972) to stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 3973. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Pepe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPEL:

S. 3974. A bill for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF BULLETIN ENTITLED "MOBILIZATION PLANNING AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY"

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, because of the world situation and the great interest in economic mobilization, it is extremely fortunate that the Library of Congress has completed studies on Mobilization Planning. Dr. William Y. Elliott, of Harvard, has headed a group making the study. It is a document which should be widely distributed and will prove of great value in our present situation. I therefore submit at this time a Senate resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document of Public Affairs Bulletin No. 81 entitled "Mobilization Planning and the National Security" prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The resolution (S. Res. 319) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Public Affairs Bulletin No. 81, entitled "Mobilization Planning and the National Security," prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6240. An act to authorize the appointment of a district judge for the north-

ern and southern districts of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6454. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CANADIAN RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT, TEXAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2733) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Canadian River reclamation project, Texas, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REFERENCE OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 98

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, Senate Concurrent Resolution 98, to print additional copies of hearings in the investigation of disloyalty in the State Department, submitted by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) on July 24, 1950, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF EXCLUSION OF JOSEPH KRIPS AND WALTER GIESEKING FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 320), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the action of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in excluding Joseph Krips and Walter Gieseck from the United States. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

YOUNG AMERICAN MEDAL FOR BRAVERY—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference an amendment to House bill 157, authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, which is on the calendar, and will be reached when the calendar is called tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me concerning the amendment may be printed in the RECORD. In the statement I have also commented on Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, requiring committee reports to include estimates of the probable cost of proposed legislation, which I submitted on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and myself,

and which is now on the calendar. My statement applies to both those matters.

I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of the concurrent resolution, as reported, be printed in the RECORD following the statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Michigan, together with a copy of the concurrent resolution, will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The statement presented by Mr. FERGUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H. R. 157, a bill pending on the Senate Calendar, and ask that the amendment be read and lie on the table.

This amendment, Mr. President, may appear on the surface to be of minor consequence. But I think it is of tremendous importance to the Congress and to the Nation because of its basis in principle.

H. R. 157 is a bill authorizing the Department of Justice to recognize and award to courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery. It comes from the Judiciary Committee, and as a member of that committee I received my attention there.

I have absolutely no lack of sympathy for the purposes of this bill. I would not wish to retard its progress except for this one fact: It is a perfect example of the Congress of the United States bestowing a new function upon an executive department without any knowledge whatsoever of that function's prospective cost.

It so happens that an investigation of this particular function's cost reveals that the principal items of expense attached to it are not expected to involve more than \$3,900 a year. Accordingly, my amendment proposes to limit the sums authorized for expenditure to \$5,000 a year. Incidentally, the investigation of cost was made by Congressman FRANK CHIEF, of Kentucky, who is the author of the bill. I deeply appreciate the fact that he has recognized the basis of my previous reservations to the measure and has borne with me and in fact endorses my amendment.

In a budget of billions the amount involved in this bill is of minor consequence. But I wish to repeat, Mr. President, that for Congress to enact any legislation without knowing its cost is to invite a fiscal fate for this Nation that is inexcusable.

I happen to be one of those who has preached governmental economy ever since I came to the Senate, and I have honestly sought to practice it. I have studied the problem of effectuating economy at considerable length. I have been a party to all of the budget-trimming devices of recent years. There may be recalled the 5- and 10-percent reduction amendments I offered to each appropriation bill in the last Congress. I joined in drafting and introducing the proposed 10-percent reduction on the pending appropriation bill.

In common with every other student of the subject that I know, however, I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible to reduce the cost of Government in anything like the measure desired by the people of this country simply by whittling at appropriations.

It is all very well to talk about cutting the deadwood out of Government offices. That needs to be done. But a flat 10-percent reduction in all Government civilian employment would realize an annual saving of only about \$646,000,000, or about 1½ percent of the entire Federal budget.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I am keenly aware of this problem. Each year I sit in those committee sessions, and I and other members search and probe for means to reduce appropriations. We are sometimes successful, for there is a great deal of padding that goes into budget estimates. But the fat which we can trim is small in proportion to the whole. And each time that we run head-on into that dead end we are told just this: "Well, Mr. Senator, you authorized the program. We are only carrying out the law, and that costs money."

Right there, Mr. President, is the core of the whole problem. Inefficiency adds to the cost of Government, but the main cost comes from the scope and size of Government and its functions.

I suggest, Mr. President, that one of the most constructive things that Congress could do would be to review all legislation on the statute books which authorizes or requires expenditures and to start from there to weed out some of the things that are absolutely unessential or least essential.

I have in mind such things as surveys whose results are published years after the period of any real usefulness, the rafts of Government publications that serve only limited demands and specialized interests, and the host of information activities that merely propagandize some governmental project.

I do not propose that Government revert to merely maintaining post roads and customs services. There are a lot of things in which Government is engaged that I object to. But realities are to be faced, and Government rarely retraces its steps. In recent years Government has assumed a vast range of functions, some of which were sought by people who had a purpose in building up a powerful, centralized authority, and others which were imposed by citizens and groups of citizens for whom Government meant a relief to some burden they were carrying.

What I am appealing for is that in designating the functions which Government is to pursue we should also weigh the fiscal consequences of those programs. I am completely satisfied that many functions authorized by Congress and otherwise considered worth while would never have been approved had their cost been made known. I am sure that the President's legislative program for this Congress was retarded in no small measure by the revelation of Senator McCLELLAN that were it to be enacted it would saddle this Nation with a future annual expenditure of \$25,000,000,000.

Congress is constantly being berated for its failure to exercise greater control over the fiscal policies of this country. The defense is sometimes made that Congress is a captive, in fiscal matters, of the executive department, which prepares the budgets. But the ultimate responsibility must be shared by Congress itself, which authorizes the activities upon which the budget estimates merely place a dollar sign.

Let me illustrate why the cost of Government increases year after year. I have here a table showing the "Increases in 1951 budget estimates for the Department of Agriculture pursuant to new legislation enacted by the first session of the Eight-first Congress." This is not to single out the Department of Agriculture as exceptional. It is just that a highly informative table was supplied by that Department to the Senate Appropriations Committee. I will ask that the table be printed at the end of my remarks. The summary shows that legislation which we enacted last year has increased Department of Agriculture appropriation requirements by almost \$75,000,000.

Going further into that subject, I want to analyze the cost of the farm housing program which Congress authorized last year as a chapter of the Housing Act of 1949.

I knew that it provided for repayable loans and grants for improvement of farm housing in an amount of about \$55,000,000 a year. What I did not know, and what I am sure no other Senator knew, was that the program would call for various agencies of the Government to come in this year and ask for \$6,224,435 to administer the program. Here is just how that happened.

The Farmers Home Administration, which administers the loans and grants that were authorized, requested \$4,637,000 for salaries and expenses.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics asked for \$40,000 "for economic research on methods of reducing costs of farm construction, the size of housing investment which can be supported by farms of different sizes, types, and income potentialities, and effect of farmers' circumstances and preferences with respect to types of housing," and \$185,000 "for surveys to determine farm housing needs and progress being made to meet these needs." That is a total of \$225,000 for that Bureau.

The extension services of the Department of Agriculture wanted \$775,000 "for technical advice and assistance in farm housing and other farm buildings."

The Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering wanted \$25,000 for "studies to determine methods of safeguarding farm buildings from decay," and \$195,900 for "development of plans and specifications and research on methods of reducing costs of construction," a total of \$220,900.

The Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics wanted \$51,000 for "development in cooperation with BPISAE (that is the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering) of suitable house plans and studies of minimum requirements for space and efficient arrangement for carrying on household activities."

Then, of course, the Office of the Solicitor in the Department of Agriculture had to be in the act. He wanted \$320,000 "for legal services."

And finally, there was the inevitable request of the Office of Information "for publications and informational services," \$15,535.

Mr. President, when we pass a piece of legislation without knowing the cost it will entail we are in effect issuing a blank check, to be cashed at a later date with the figures written in. I object strenuously to that procedure. When I write a personal check I want to know what will be deducted from my bank account. The American people are also entitled to know what will be deducted from their bank accounts when we write checks in the form of legislation authorizing new governmental activities.

One positive way of telling them that amount is to place the figure itself in the authorizing legislation as a maximum amount. That is what I have proposed to do with H. R. 157 as an illustration of a paramount necessity.

It may not always be practicable to write a precise limitation into the bill itself. In my opinion that does not excuse the Congress from making every effort to inform itself of the expected cost of any piece of legislation. For that reason I have introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, which is now pending on the calendar. I earnestly hope we can get action on it in this session.

That measure would require that every bill reported out of a legislative committee be accompanied by a statement of the proposed legislation's cost over a 5-year period of operation.

Considering the fiscal problems with which this Government is confronted, that cost information is vital to the evaluation of any piece of legislation.

Without knowledge of the cost of the legislation upon which it is passing, Congress cannot exercise the fiscal control which is its constitutional responsibility, and it can never hope to see the day when government economy is a reality, and not a promise.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) All bills and joint resolutions reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned with the expenditure of any funds required to meet the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included within the accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilation (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) in the form of anticipated legislative budgets for each of the ensuing 5 fiscal years for the information of the Congress."

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 25, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1027. An act for the relief of the Merit Co.;

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades;

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Tefvik Kamil Kutay;

S. 2364. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; and

S. 3937. An act to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR WARREN, OF FLORIDA, BEFORE THE INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Governor Warren, of Florida, before the Investment Bankers Association at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, on June 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENTS BY HOWLAND H. SARGEANT ON REPORT ON FIFTH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter signed by Howland H. Sargeant, chairman, United States delegation, commenting on the report on the Fifth General Conference of UNESCO, recently held in Florence, Italy, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIUMPH MOSCOW'S IF WE BECOME POLICE STATE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BRIDGEPORT SUNDAY HERALD

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Triumph Moscow's if We Become Police State," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald, July 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRACTICE OF GENOCIDE BY THE AUTHORITIES OF THE SOVIET UNION

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for Ratification of the Genocide Convention, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM—ARTICLE FROM THE CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "No Loafers," with reference to the Federal prison system, written by J. Pope Dyer, and published in the Chattanooga News-Free Press of June 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY TRAINING—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND LETTER FROM DANIEL A. POLING

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Universal Military Training," and a letter from Dr. Daniel A. Poling on the subject of military training both from the New York Times of Sunday, July 23, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST—ADDRESS BY DR. EMORY W. LUCCOCK

[Mr. SCHOEPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Emory W. Luccock, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Wichita, Kans., before the Wichita Rotary Club on July 3, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FILM FLUMMERY—ARTICLE BY BOSLEY CROWTHER

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Film Flummery," written by Bosley Crowther, and published in the New York Times on July 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HAMILTON-JEFFERSON PATHWAY TO ECONOMIC PROGRESS—ADDRESS BY BERTRAM M. GROSS

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on

the subject The Hamilton-Jefferson Pathway to Economic Progress, delivered by Bertram M. Gross, Executive Secretary of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, before the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., July 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAINTENANCE OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES—STATEMENT OF PACIFIC COAST COUNCIL OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of Pacific Coast Council, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., to Water Resources Policy Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL POWER POLICY BY PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD recommendations for Federal Power Policy, prepared by Thomas W. Delzell, Chairman of the Board of the Portland General Electric Co., which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES—OFFICIAL FBI FIGURES

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the official figures as to Communists in the United States, by States, prepared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE WAR IN KOREA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "The Enemy at Home Is Dangerous: Uncover Him!" published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, signed by Mr. Harley Hise, Chairman of the Board, relating to the appropriation for the administrative expenses of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

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

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, July 21, 1950.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: In the Senate debate on H. R. 7786, as reported on pages 10166 and 10167 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14, 1950, there appeared to be some misunderstanding on the part of certain Senators speaking in opposition to the proposed amendment restoring \$700,000 of the House reduction of \$1,100,000 in the administrative expense authorization of the RFC for the current fiscal year. I am writing to clarify some of the points raised, with the thought that this information will be helpful to you in the forthcoming joint conference on H. R. 7786 with members of the House Committee on Appropriations.

First, I should like to discuss the budgetary implications of Reorganization Plan 22, which provides for the transfer of FNMA to the Housing and Home Finance Agency on

September 7, 1950. As you know, funds for administrative expenses of the RFC are not appropriated by the Congress. Instead, the annual appropriation bills authorize the Corporation to make necessary expenditures for this purpose, subject to specific limitation, out of corporate funds. This same authority extends to FNMA, as a subsidiary of the Corporation, and the dollar limitation established by the Congress covers the administrative expenses of both the RFC and FNMA. When FNMA is transferred, the administrative expense limitation will be apportioned between the RFC and HHFA by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and RFC will have left only the amount necessary to carry on its remaining programs. I point this out to emphasize that the transfer of FNMA under Reorganization Plan 22 will not effect a reduction in the combined budget of RFC and FNMA, and it is the combined budget which the Congress is presently considering, rather than the budget of only the RFC.

We are not in a position at this time to provide you with the exact dollar amount which will be transferred to HHFA for the FNMA program. As you know, mortgage activities of FNMA are integrated with the loan operations of the RFC, and an extensive analysis of expenses and assignment of personnel will be necessary before an equitable segregation of administrative funds can be accomplished. Tentatively, however, we estimate that approximately \$4,000,000 will be transferred, of which \$3,200,000 will provide for salaries of some 750 employees to be transferred to HHFA. You will note that this is less than the amount shown in the budget document, and it is also approximately \$1,500,000 less than the current rate of expenditure of the FNMA program. As I stated before, FNMA activities are integrated with other lending activities of the Corporation, and in our organization are administered by the same supervisory personnel responsible for the proper administration of other RFC programs. In the allocation of administrative costs as stated in the budget document and other reports, this overhead expense is properly prorated between RFC and FNMA. Obviously, however, the Corporation could not transfer any appreciable number of its management group or top supervisors to another agency without seriously endangering the administration of its loan activities. An analysis of our administrative costs indicates that approximately 30 percent of the total represents nontransferable overhead, which accounts for the difference between our estimate of \$4,000,000 to be transferred to HHFA and the current rate of expenditure of FNMA amounting to approximately \$5,500,000.

Next, I should like to comment briefly on the Senate's restoration of \$700,000 of the \$1,100,000 reduction in our authorization recommended by the House. The major item to be considered in this connection is the cost of custodial and fiscal services performed for the Corporation by the Federal Reserve banks. Our budget originally provided \$650,000 for this purpose. The House reduced that amount by \$600,000 on the basis that these services should be discontinued immediately and the work transferred to the field offices of the Corporation. As we stated during the hearings before your subcommittee, we are in complete accord with the House recommendation that custody of the security documents of the Corporation should be taken over from the Federal Reserve banks, but because of the thousands of documents involved, transfer cannot be accomplished immediately. The Senate has restored \$300,000, or one-half of the \$600,000 reduction recommended by the House. I believe that this will provide the Corporation with sufficient funds to reimburse the Federal Reserve banks until an orderly transfer can be accomplished, probably by December

31, 1950. There has been a recent development in this take-over of the custody function which may alter our plans somewhat. Representatives of HHFA have requested that we do not transfer the custody of mortgages from the Federal Reserve banks to our field offices until they have had an opportunity to investigate thoroughly the type and cost of services performed by the banks. This request does not, I am sure, represent any basic disagreement on their part with the recommendation of the House Committee on Appropriations, but is made rather for the purpose of deferring any procedural changes until they have had an opportunity to evaluate all phases of the FNMA operations and have concluded their planning with respect to the FNMA organization and procedures for transfer to their agency.

The remaining \$400,000 of the \$700,000 increase passed by the Senate represents a partial restoration of House reductions in personnel and related expenses. In view of the continuing heavy workload on loan applications and mortgages, I consider the restoration of this \$400,000 of primary importance. Our original estimate provided for an increase of 90 man-years, and while the \$400,000 will provide for only a part of that increase, it will help materially in eliminating backlogs of work in our field offices.

I should like to express my gratitude for your eminently fair and impartial consideration of the Corporation's budget requirements, and I sincerely hope that the authorization of \$26,700,000 as passed by the Senate will stand in the bill as finally enacted. Any lesser amount will certainly have an adverse effect on the proper administration of the Corporation's programs.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY HISE,
Chairman.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may address an inquiry to the acting majority leader?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether he intends to have a quorum call. Several Senators have requested that a quorum call be had when the Senator from Wisconsin took the floor. I would rather have the acting majority leader suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin desire a quorum call?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would be well to have one.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be very glad to yield for that purpose.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Kem	Neely
Darby	Langer	Schoeppel
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah.
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	Martin	
Humphrey	Mundt	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed

to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. HOEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MYERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAFT, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BENTON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. KERR, and Mr. JENNER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG also entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULERIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am about to do today what I had hoped it would not be necessary to do, namely, to use those portions of the State Department loyalty files which were developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I picked out what I think is a typical case of the 81 examined by the Tydings-McMahon committee. I feel that the Senate and the country should know what is in a typical case which has been given a clean bill of health by the Tydings-McMahon committee. I dislike doing this, Mr. President, I decided not to do it until after the committee finished its work. I hoped the committee would go into the matter in some detail. My principal reason for not wanting to do it is that I feared it might

in some way embarrass the Federal Bureau of Investigation in future investigations; that it might in some way hamper them. However, I have stricken from the secret file the names of all informants and any other information which might in any way indicate who they are.

While I did not discuss this matter with Mr. Hoover or any of his chief aides, or the heads of any other intelligence agencies, I did have in my office a man from one of the intelligence agencies and went over this matter with him in some detail. He assured me that sufficient material had been deleted from the report so as in no way to hamper any future investigation.

Mr. President, while I have deleted the name of this individual, so that there will be no question that he is today working in the State Department in a very important job, I shall hand the complete file, with nothing deleted from it, to the Senator on my right, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE]. I shall also hand him the State Department telephone directory for 1950 containing the name of this individual. While the telephone directory does not indicate his importance, perhaps the Senator can get some idea of how he rates in the Department by the number of telephones he has. Incidentally, I had my staff call the Department yesterday, and call this man's office. He is still in the State Department. This is not one of the marginal cases, nor is it one of the worst cases. I tried to pick out a typical case from the 81 cases that were given to the committee.

The Senate will recall that more than 5 months ago I stated that I had the names of 57 individuals who either are or recently had been working in the State Department, and who were either members of the Communist Party or certainly loyal thereto and doing the work of the party. At various times I referred to them as Communists or card-carrying Communists. I want to make it clear that when I refer to a card-carrying member I do not necessarily mean a man who has a little slip of cardboard in his pocket indicating that he has paid his dues. By a card-carrying member I mean the type of individual described in this FBI secret report which I hold in my hand.

We find that the FBI placed in the Communist Party in 1937 one of their undercover agents. This man remained in the Communist Party until 1948. At that time he was expelled because, I assume, they suspected his being an agent for one of the intelligence agencies. The FBI lists this man as responsible and reliable. He is not listed as such by the Tydings committee or by me, but by the FBI.

It will be noted on page 2 of the photostat, in the third paragraph, that this agent's record was one of complete reliability. We find in this report that this FBI undercover agent, the man who was employed by the FBI and placed in the Communist Party, in his statement under oath states that this official in the State Department was a member of the party and was active in it. He states

that this individual's wife also was a member of the party and was a member of and active in the Young Communist League. So when I refer to a card-carrying Communist, that is the kind of individual I refer to, even though there is nothing to show that he actually has a card in his pocket.

After notifying the President and the Senate that I had the names of 57 individuals, I supplied the committee with a résumé not only of the 57 cases but of a total of 81 cases.

As I stated at the time, some of the 81 cases were marginal cases of individuals who might well prove that they were completely loyal and that they were not members of the Communist Party, but there was evidence against them indicating the opposite.

I notified the Senate at that time that it would be impossible for me personally to present sufficient evidence, separate and apart from the information contained in the Government files, to convict them of being Communists in a court of law. In other words, in order to prove them to be Communists, the files would have to be used, because for example, for me to reproduce the information in the file I hold in my hand would cost tens of thousands of dollars. This work was done by many agents. It was done by an agent in Minnesota, one in Michigan, one in New York, one in New Haven, one in San Francisco, one whose location is not indicated, one in Chicago, one in Virginia, and one in Washington, D. C. The name of the agent who did the work in Washington, D. C., is Thomas A. Conroy, who I understand is one of the top FBI agents. As I told the Senate, it would be impossible for me to reproduce that information. If the committee was to do a good job they would have to take advantage of the millions of man-hours of the men who worked for the FBI, the Central Intelligence Agency, Army Intelligence, Navy Intelligence, and other agencies.

Apparently the Senate agreed with me at that time that it would be impossible for me to try to reproduce the evidence in these files. The Senate voted unanimously that the committee should do the job, and the Senate voted the committee almost unlimited funds and gave the committee authority to subpoena not merely the raped or denuded State Department loyalty files but all the files in the intelligence agencies.

The Senate felt that this job should be done honestly and above board. There is no reason why the committee should not have all the information about all the individuals accused of being Communists, and no reason why the committee should not have all the files including those of Central Intelligence, Army Intelligence, ONI, and Secret Service.

Mr. President, after the committee had been given this task and unlimited funds and authority with which to perform it, I gathered that my task would end at that point. However, when the President decided to give the committee only the rifed State Department files I felt it necessary to try to produce independ-

ently of the files some of the extremely dangerous evidence against certain individuals which is contained in the complete files. That was done with some degree of success, but with great difficulty and at considerable expense. While the committee was examining the 81 files I did not feel justified in publicly using the evidence in them. I felt it was necessary first to find the extent of the committee's investigation of the files, the extent to which they were rifled, and so forth. In view of the fact that the committee has now finished its work and has now been discharged, and in view of the majority report that none of the 81 individuals named by me on the floor were found to be Communist or pro-Communist, I feel I have no choice but to make public the contents of a typical file of one of the 81 individuals named by me, so the Senate and the country may know what the committee had before it and upon which its decision was based. In doing so, I am mindful of the fact that I pointed out that the files were thoroughly rifled prior to the committee's examination. However, the three majority members of the committee were unanimous in stating that the files had not been touched and that they were complete; and that all FBI material which had been furnished the State Department was reviewed by them. If such was the case, the material which I am giving the Senate and the country today was before the Senators and examined by them.

Incidentally, Mr. President, in connection with the Tydings-McMahon committee's statement that they found no evidence on any of the 81 individuals indicating they were Communists or pro-Communists, and in view of the fact that they gave all the 81 individuals a clean bill of health, I think it should be noted that case No. 19 of the 81 was the case of Mr. William Remington. The Senate will recall that at the time the committee took this action, Mr. Remington was working in the Department of Commerce with Mr. Lee. The Senate will recall that the Commerce Department and the State Department did quite a job of keeping from Korea and Formosa, and that area, the materials the Congress voted for them. At that time Mr. Remington was over there, secure in his job. I urged the staff of the committee that they give priority to the case of Remington. I felt he was a dangerous man, as was the other one exposed in the Commerce Department, Michael Lee. While Mr. Remington was not technically on the payroll of the State Department, his name was included, because he was working so closely with the State Department there there was no way of knowing whether he was under the orders of the State Department or the Commerce Department, unless one checked the payroll.

Mr. President, the Tydings-McMahon committee took no action whatsoever on Remington. They said, "You go ahead and give us the proof." I stated to them that they would find in his file the statements of men who were in the Communist movement with him, showing that he also was a member of the Communist

Party. This, of course, was given the same treatment as all the evidence I gave the committee. However, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, on its own, took this matter up and did an excellent job. It furnished the grand jury with information, with the end result that Mr. Remington was indicted for perjury in connection with his communistic activities.

Mr. President, it seems rather unusual, therefore—if we even take that one case alone, it is rather unusual—that the Tydings-McMahon committee could say that in the 81 cases, which included Remington, "We found no evidence of either communism or of anyone being pro-Communist," even after the grand jury had indicted a man in connection with his communistic activities.

Mr. President, I shall now read a typical file of one of the individuals named by me. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this FBI report shows that an FBI agent, an under-cover agent, joined the Communist Party in 1937 at the suggestion of the FBI; that he remained a party member until he was expelled in 1948; that during that time he was found to be absolutely reliable. He testified that this State Department official, whom we shall call Mr. X, was personally known to him to be a member of the Communist Party, and that X had told him that he had been a member of the party before coming to this country. The State Department official, incidentally, was born in Moscow. It will be noted also that this FBI undercover agent made the unqualified statement that X's wife was also a member of the party both before and after her marriage to X, and that she was a member and active in the Young Communist League.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.
Mr. WHERRY. Where was this testimony adduced by the FBI agent?

Mr. McCARTHY. The testimony in the first three pages of the report was produced by Special Agent Thomas A. Conroy. Senators will note that in some cases I have stricken out the information indicating where a witness may reside. I did that purposely, so that I would not in any way endanger any FBI informant. Senators will notice this was received by the Civil Service Commission on September 10 or 16—I cannot tell by the stamp which is the correct date—1948. The distribution was "To the Department of State, three copies." So this was sent to the Department of State.

I feel that in frankness I should have announced, as I have, that I do not think this material was in the file at the time of the examination. The Senators say it was, so we will take their word for that for the time being.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska will understand my reason for not trying to indicate exactly in what city some of this information was produced. I might say that at the time of the Coplon trial

I felt that when the court ordered that the files be made available to the public, it was a great mistake to the court yes, but to the public, no. I felt that to divulge the names of the informants, the methods of operation, the method the FBI used in getting its men into the movement, may have set the Bureau back years. I have tried to avoid doing that in my presentation.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator to say now that the members of the investigating committee state that all this material was in the files when they examined the case.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senators repeatedly said that the material was in the file when they examined the case. Senators will remember that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] went to the White House, looked at the 81 files—he said there were 81—some of them 4 or 5 or 6 inches thick. He came away in half an hour and said, "The files are complete. Everything is there." I questioned that before, and I still question it.

I produced the statements of four witnesses who worked in the State Department, who were part of a group of eight who worked for 6 months cleaning out the files. We have their signed statements to that effect. So far as I know, there is no reason why these individuals would lie about it.

I frankly do not think this material was before the Senators; but it was a part of the files. This file I have shows it was received by the Civil Service Commission, and forwarded to the State Department. It should have been there. I might say, in connection with whether the files were complete or not, that the Senate will recall that on the twentieth day of June the Senator from Maryland called a press interview. At that time he said that the FBI had made an investigation, a complete investigation, of all the files, and that all the files were complete in every detail. I of course knew that was not so, so I wrote to J. Edgar Hoover asking whether it was true, whether his bureau had made an investigation of these files and had stated everything was in them. I have here a copy of J. Edgar Hoover's letter in reply.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish this. I have a copy of J. Edgar Hoover's letter, which was written about 20 days after the Senator from Maryland stated the FBI had examined the files. Let me read one paragraph from the letter. Mr. Hoover said:

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has made no such examination and therefore is not in a position to make any statement concerning the completeness or incompleteness of the State Department files.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The stamp on the paper the Senator has presented shows,

does it not, that the United States Civil Service Commission received this report on September 14, 1948?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is September 10 or 14 or 16, 1948. I cannot make out very well from the photostat the exact date.

Mr. LANGER. A moment ago the Senator spoke about the four affidavits with which he supplied the Senate some time ago. As I remember those affidavits, the affiants said they were working in the State Department in 1945.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it was 1946. They were working there at the time the plans were being made for the President's loyalty program. They were working there from July or August until December 31, 1946. So the rifling job they did would not have gotten this part of the file, which is dated 1948. But, as I told the Senate, there was a great house-cleaning job going on, a second one, before the Senate committee started examining the files, and I hope to have the affidavits on that, too.

In connection with the first rifling job, the Senator will recall the President sent the loyalty order on the 27th of October, or November—it was October, as I recall, before election. That was not to go into effect until the Senate appropriated money to put the program into effect. So that it would seem that the first rifling job that was done, the first house-cleaning job, was either in preparation for the President's own loyalty program or perhaps in anticipation of the new Congress, which was taking over on January 1, 1947. The statements, it will be noted, refer to personnel files. At that time that was what they were known as, because there was no loyalty program, so there was no such thing then as a loyalty file.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Wisconsin now referring to the observations the Senator from Wisconsin made that the files were rifled and that there were four affidavits signed to that effect?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct, though they were not affidavits. My investigators do not have the right to administer the oath.

Mr. WHERRY. They were signed statements?

Mr. McCARTHY. They were signed statements.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the same incident the Senator from Maryland referred to, that there were no signed statements to that effect, and even if they were, the men who were employed to do this job, did not know what they were doing, and did not know that the files were being rifled?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. The Senator from Maryland said the other day that the statements were all unsigned. I might say that when I gave the Senate the photostats of those statements, the signatures appeared on three of them. One of them was a Mr. Threadgill, who is now an agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He, incidentally, did not take part in the

rifling task. He was in one of the adjoining rooms. The clean files were brought to him and he made out new cards. His statement was to the effect, however, that State Department employees came over and participated in cleaning out their own files.

When the Senator from Maryland or anyone else says that these young men did not know what they were doing, I would suggest that the Senator call up Mr. Threadgill and have him come over to his office and sit down with him. He is a fine intelligent young man. He is a competent and trusted FBI agent. There is no reason on earth why he should come over to my office and lie to me. The same is true in regard to another young man, a Mr. Sullivan. He is a third year student at Georgetown in the Foreign Service School. He is a very intelligent young man. There is no reason why he should lie. The same can be said of the other two who signed statements.

One of the individuals is a man who now works in the State Department. When I presented his statement to the Senate I did delete his name, because he said "If they know I signed this I will lose my job." I sent that on to the President, and I told the President that if he would assure me that this young man would not lose his job for having told the truth, then I would be glad to contact the young man and get his permission to give the President his name. Incidentally, the President has never answered that letter, which is rather surprising in view of the fact that he has suggested that "if McCARTHY has any information of wrongdoing in the State Department, if he has any information which should be brought to my attention, if he knows anything about the rifling of the files, if he knows anything about Communists, why does he not bring that information to me, the President of the United States?" So I have brought that information to him, and have been greeted by not even the courtesy of an answer.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The next question I was about to ask has to do with that matter. The Senator has answered my first question. But now another question has arisen. Did the committee interrogate or bring in Mr. Threadgill or the other men whose names the Senator furnished the committee?

Mr. McCARTHY. Absolutely not. Just the usual State Department release saying that "McCARTHY is lying, and does not have those statements."

Mr. WHERRY. The committee could have interrogated them and found out for itself what those men were doing with the files?

Mr. McCARTHY. Absolutely. There can be no question about it.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator know that yesterday the President of the United States made an appeal to the

people in this crisis to report any cases of subversion, or espionage, or treason, and so forth. Did the Senator know that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; I read that.

Mr. JENNER. Then I will ask the Senator: What good would it do the people of the country to report anything to the President of the United States in connection with subversion or treason or espionage?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would appear that it would do no good, I will say to the Senator. I might say in that connection also we have here photostats of an FBI report showing they went to tremendous expense, that they went even to the point of putting men in the Communist Party, at great danger to those young men. One of the agents reported that one of the party members is a man up high in the State Department and he gave much evidence to back it up. Now, contrary to what some of our friends try to tell the country, the FBI has no power on earth to order this State Department employee discharged. They cannot even order his prosecution. Only the Justice Department can do that. For a long period of time they could not arrest him without permission of the State Department. I think that order has now been countermanded. Now they must merely get the permission of the Department of Justice. And whose permission do Senators think they must get over there? Mr. Peyton Ford's.

One of the other things in connection—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator goes to another point will he yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me first say a word in connection with the Senator's question as to what good it will do to give this information to the President. I heard some of my friends from the other side of the aisle the other day say that if McCARTHY were honest and sincere about this, if he were not trying to practice fraud and deceit upon the Senate, then he would have brought this information to the attention of the FBI. In that connection let me point out that here we have a complete FBI case. People brought information to the attention of the FBI. The FBI did an outstanding job. But what happens? Material is thrown into a file and allowed to lie there. Let me tell the Senate what happened when this matter came to the Loyalty Board.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to read the statement which was made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, which appears on page 10711 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when the Senator from Maryland made his speech on last Friday. He said:

Then the Senator from Wisconsin said they had been rifled in 1946, and he had some affidavits, which were unsigned.

That is a positive statement. What is the Senator's answer to that statement by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator for raising that question. I have been answering the State Department and the Tydings-McMahon Committee largely with documentation recently, so I am going to do the same thing here. I ask if a page will call up my office and ask my clerk to send over the original signed statements. I will give the Senator the signed statements, three with the signatures on, and the fourth which a present employee of the State Department signed. I cannot give the Senator his name.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we ought to have that information. It ought to be a part of the Record. Either they are signed or unsigned. I should like to have the distinguished Senator give us that answer. I appreciate the fact that he is going to bring in the evidence.

Second, the Senator from Maryland proceeded to say:

It would not have made any difference if they had been signed.

What is the Senator's answer to that allegation or statement?

Mr. McCARTHY. God only knows. I do not know. Here we have four reputable witnesses who signed statements, who said, "We took out all the derogatory material." They say the State Department employees came over and they were able to pick out the bad stuff out of their own files. And the chairman of the committee, who is supposed to be conducting an investigation, and who told the Senate that none of the files were rifled, that they were complete, says it does not make any difference if four of those former State Department employees gave signed statements to the effect that they were members of the rifling squad.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I remember, one of the affidavits said it was a project, and it gave the name of the individual who was in charge of that project.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us if he knows whether or not the man in charge of the project was ever subpoenaed by the subcommittee?

Mr. McCARTHY. He was not I will say to the Senator. He is working in the State Department. My investigator tried to get in contact with him, but, naturally, was unsuccessful.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator if he means to tell the Senate that the man who these four witnesses said was in charge of that project is still working for the State Department today?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. First, let me make this clear. I am not sure that the man in charge of the project initiated it. In fact, I am reasonably certain he did not. I assume he was assigned to that work by some of the top brass, and that it was merely a job he was given to do.

There are eight all told; and I have affidavits from four. What I have just said is also true of the four whose names are given, who did the rifling job. They

were assigned to that task, and they had no way in the world of knowing whether it was right or wrong. So we cannot blame them.

As to the man in charge of the immediate project, whether he was at fault I do not know. He should have been subpoenaed, and should have been asked who told him to do the job; and he should have been required to produce, under subpoena, the written instructions covering what he was doing.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is that man still employed by the State Department?

Mr. McCARTHY. He is still employed by the State Department, so far as I can determine.

Mr. LANGER. So he is available to the committee, is he?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, definitely.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the file, a copy of which he has brought here, is one of the files which was made available to the committee by the FBI.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct; it is 1 of the 81 which the committee had made available to it.

Mr. President, I may say this is a typical file; there is nothing unusual about it. I tried to pick out a typical case, not one of the marginal cases, not one of the extremes either way.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I will say that during the 10 days or so that I was at the White House, at no time were all the files there together. The statement was made to us that the files were in use. There would be a pile of files on a large table. But at no time were all the files there.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

Moreover, Mr. President, in connection with the question of whether or not the files were cleaned out, I think I should call attention to a letter—in view of the questions asked by the Senator from Nebraska—which the Senator from Maryland read on the floor of the Senate the other day, as appears on page 10711 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, July 20—a letter allegedly from J. Howard McGrath, and addressed to the Senator from Maryland. The letter reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: At my request the Federal Bureau of Investigation has conducted an examination of the State Department files which the members of your committee have been reviewing. Previously Deputy Attorney General Ford advised you, under date of June 16, 1950, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had furnished him a copy of all loyalty material which had been furnished the State Department in these cases, that a check had been made under his direction, and that it was found that all of the FBI reports and memoranda which had been furnished the State Department were contained in the file.

I requested the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a similar investigation of these files, in view of the further question raised several days ago by Senator McCARTHY regarding their completeness. The examination, made on July 3—

That was before the Senate committee had finished its investigation—

by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, discloses that the files contain all FBI reports and memorandums furnished to the department in these cases prior to the time they were turned over to your committee—

And so forth. Mr. President, it will be noted that this letter from J. Howard McGrath says that on July 3 the FBI conducted an investigation and found them complete. Again I call attention to the second paragraph of the letter from J. Edgar Hoover, in which he says that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has made no such examination and therefore is not in a position to make any statement concerning the completeness or incompleteness of the State Department files.

In view of the fact that the date here is rather important, I cannot believe that the Senator from Maryland purposely misread that to the Senate; I am sure he would not try to deceive the Senate and make it believe that the FBI had made an examination before he had finished viewing the files. Apparently J. Howard McGrath made a mistake—inadvertently, I am sure; but a lot of mistakes have been made.

A minute ago the Senator asked whether the statements I had gotten from the three former employees of the State Department and a fourth, who now is in the State Department, were or were not signed. I now would like to hand to the Senator a copy of the statements, one signed by Paul E. Sullivan, dated July 6, 1950, with the phone number, in his own handwriting; and witnessed by Mr. Surine, who is one of my investigators. Incidentally, Mr. Surine had been with the FBI for about 10 years, and worked on subjects having to do with disclosure of Communists a considerable part of that time.

The second one is signed by Bernie Threadgill, Jr.; and the third one is signed by Francis Eugene O'Brien, dated, and in his own handwriting. And there is a fourth one, from which I have deleted the name, because he is working in the State Department.

The Senator will notice that not only were the statements signed, but each page was signed; and whenever a correction was made, the correction was initialed. So there can be no question that these are the complete statements by these individuals.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, would the Senator say, then, that the Senator from Maryland was in error relative to whether or not the statements were unsigned?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to ask him a further question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. One of these men is still with the FBI; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, yes. Let me make clear that the young man who is with the FBI had not been with the FBI at the time he was doing this job.

The young man who is now with the Bureau did not take part in the actual rifling job. Senators will notice that he has drawn a diagram showing the room in which he worked, which was off of the main room in which the house-cleaning job was being done. Senators will notice that his statement is to the effect that the cleaned files were brought to him; that he did not go into the main room, and did not know what was going on there; but what those in that room told him, was that the State Department employees were coming there to help clean out their own files.

I want to make it clear that the other three individuals were members of the crew of eight who did the actual house-cleaning jobs.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, let me ask once again: The signatures and names are here, and those persons could have been subpoenaed and interrogated by the committee relative to the statements made in these affidavits. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. Absolutely; there is no question about it. In fact, Mr. O'Brien and the other man, the one from the Georgetown Foreign Service School, said they would be glad to come without being subpoenaed, and would be glad to give the information.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I think he is clearing up at least that error.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say to the Senator that I hope to produce additional affidavits covering some of the handling of the files, at a later date.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LONGER. As I recollect the evidence—and I have a fairly good memory—that was not a job that lasted for 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 days, but it lasted for 6 months. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. Let me read to the Senator, if I may, a typical statement—for instance, take Mr. Sullivan's statement:

JULY 6, 1950.

The following information is given by me freely and voluntarily without any promises whatsoever. I furnish this information because it is the truth and I feel it is my patriotic duty to furnish the facts as I experienced them.

I am living at 1902 North Fifteenth Street, Arlington, Va., at the present time.

In August 1946, I was released from the United States Navy in California. I came to Washington, D. C., and while in Washington, D. C., I was looking for a job. I went into the Walker Johnson Building of State Department at Eighteenth and New York Avenue NW. I talked to a fellow in the State Department by the name of Holcombe. I got a temporary clerical job in the files at the Walker Johnson Building.

These files were the departmental personnel files located in the Walker Johnson Building. I started work in these files in September 1946. When I reported for duty I was told that I would be working on a project on these files. This project had been going on for some time before I started.

There were at least eight persons who were working on this project.

I was not formally and specifically instructed as to what the purpose of the project was, but from what I was instructed by the other clerks, I and the other clerks were to go through each personnel file and pull out all derogatory material from the files. In addition to the usual personnel forms, the files contained all kinds of letters, reports, memorandum concerning the individual person. As per instructions I received, all of the clerks on this project were to pull out of the files all matters considered derogatory either morally or politically.

The project was very confused—

I assume it would be—

but I and the other clerks pulled out of each personnel file any material which could be considered derogatory. This material was removed and some was thrown in wastebaskets by us and some was thrown in—

And there is a deletion, which he has initialed—

a cardboard box. I don't know what happened to the derogatory material we pulled out from the files, but I do know of my own knowledge that a good lot of it was destroyed.

I do not recall details of each personnel file I examined, but the material I pulled out of the files pertained to either the morals of the person or in some way reflected on his or her loyalty.

By "morals" this young man indicated that anything indicating sexual perversion was taken from the files. I continue:

I recall one thick report on one State Department employee who was accused of being a photographer and a member of some subversive organization which published some sort of news report. This was removed from the file and disposed of.

I worked from September 'till the end of December 1946, working on this file project pulling out and disposing of the derogatory material as per my understanding given me.

I left on December 31, 1946, and this project on the personnel files was still not finished, but my temporary appointment ran out and my employment with the State Department ended.

I can't recall who the official in charge of these files was. I met him only a very few times, but I could easily recognize him if I saw him.

I have read this statement of three pages and the facts are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I may say to the Senator that one of the other statements contains the name of the individual who was head of the project. His name was George Copp. This is from the affidavit of Mr. Threadgill, who says:

This project was being performed apparently on some sort of dead line date because George Copp—

At that point there are several deletions which are initialed—

who was supervisor over the clerks on this project was often telling me and the others that we had to get the job done and that it had already passed the dead line * * *

So that Mr. George Copp was head of the project.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am somewhat confused about whether the distinguished Senator was allowed to be present at all times while the committee was interrogating witnesses. Will the Senator be kind enough to enlighten me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad the Senator asked that question. The answer is "No." As the Senator knows, the usual senatorial practice is that when a Senator is interested in a subject which is before a committee, he is not only allowed to be present, but also allowed to question the witnesses. As the Senator will recall, at the time of the confirmation of the head of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Lillenthal, the very able Senator from Tennessee, who was not a member of the committee, was present and conducted the cross-examination for 1 or 2 weeks. It has long been the practice.

To begin with, I was denied the right to cross-examine—which I thought was a mistake, not because I felt I was more competent potentially as a cross-examiner, but I had been living with this thing for 4 or 5 or 6 months and knew all the background. I felt I could be of some benefit to the committee. For example, when Browder came before the committee, when Frederick Vanderbilt Field, a man who is a professed Communist, who has been financing communistic ventures, who to a great extent financed the publication run by the present Ambassador at Large, Mr. Jessup, I wanted to ask some questions. I wanted to ask Field, for instance, to bring down his financial records so we could see which of the other pet projects of State Department employees was being financed by Communist money. The committee said, "No," but that I could be present. The committee then went into executive session. I asked the chairman whether I would be allowed to attend the executive session. Those were the executive sessions, the Senator will understand, which were being attended by Mr. Lattimore and by his lawyer, Mr. Abe Fortas. Those were executive sessions, it will be understood, attended by a local lawyer, who had no connection with the Senate, and by Mr. Owen Lattimore.

I asked the chairman whether I could attend those sessions. First, his answer was "No," and I told him I would not produce any witnesses, that it would be impossible, that I had enough trouble getting witnesses, as it was. When I went out to see a witness and talked to him, he would at least want to know whether I was to be present to give him some semblance of protection, in view of the browbeating he had seen witnesses get before the committee. The Senator from Maryland said, "Well, yes, you can be present, but you cannot cross-examine."

So the next day, when one of my witnesses was produced—I should not say "my witness," but one of the witnesses I had named was produced—I went into the committee room, and on my way to the room I found the Republican counsel, Mr. Morris, leaving the room. I said, "Where are you going?" He said, "Tydings kicked me out."

I said, "Who is in the room?" He said, "Oh, Lattimore and his lawyers are there, and Mr. CONNALLY, I think—and the committee members."

So I went in. I was notified by the Senator from Maryland that I would not be allowed to remain. That was unusual, so I insisted that he put it up to the committee and get a committee vote. I did not think the chairman should take it upon himself to expel another Senator, especially in view of the fact that Mr. Owen Lattimore was there. He refused to accede to my request. He said, "No, you have got to leave." So I left the committee room.

I think that answers the Senator's question. I was not even allowed to be in the room while the witnesses whom I had requested to be present were called and examined.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. LANGER. Prior to becoming United States Senator, if I may inquire, how long was the distinguished Senator judge of the district court in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I was technically a judge for about 7 years; actually, I was only on the bench for about 3½ years, because I left the bench and went into the Marine Air Corps.

Mr. LANGER. During that time, I assume, the Senator presided as judge at the trial of a great many lawsuits, did he not?

Mr. MCCARTHY. A great many, yes.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator believe that, had he been allowed to interrogate and to cross-examine the witnesses, a great many other facts would have been adduced?

Mr. MCCARTHY. In answer to that, let me say to the Senator what I said to the committee. I told the Senator from Maryland that if I were allowed to cross-examine Mr. Owen Lattimore and Frederick Vanderbilt Field, they would either indict themselves or perjure themselves, because I had the background information from which we could either bring out the facts that they would have to admit, or else they would have to perjure themselves.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, it will be noted from this report—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did the Senator furnish that background information to the minority members of the committee?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Did I furnish what?

Mr. McFARLAND. The background information which the Senator said he had, and by which he could compel these men to perjure themselves. Did he fur-

nish that same information to the minority members of the committee?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I worked very closely with the counsel, Mr. Morris, and while I did not give all information directly to the Senator from Massachusetts, or to the Senator from Iowa, I did discuss all important items of evidence with Mr. Morris, which I understand he passed on to the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa. But let me say that Mr. Morris was not allowed to cross-examine, but only allowed to be in the committee room. The Republican counsel was only allowed to be in the committee room, not allowed to cross-examine. I understand that, after the Senator from Massachusetts had said, and the Senator from Iowa, I believe, said the same thing—and if I am wrong in this, I hope I shall be corrected—"Either the minority counsel will be allowed to cross-examine, or we are through with this farce." Then Mr. Morris was allowed to cross-examine, but the committee hearings did not last very long after that. Mr. Morris was not allowed to cross-examine Mr. Browder. He was not allowed to cross-examine Mr. Field.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I may say that Mr. Morris, the assistant counsel, appointed on behalf of the minority, was not allowed to cross-examine either Mr. Field or Mr. Browder or Mr. Lattimore; which I thought was a very great pity. I may say to the Senator from Arizona, because it would have increased very much the amount of confidence in the committee's findings. The public could feel that the witnesses had been questioned from all viewpoints, and I think it is a great shame that that did not happen. Obviously, Members of the Senate who have their duties to attend to on the floor and in other places, cannot possibly undertake to handle the enormous amount of detail that comes into a work of this kind. They have to be able to work through counsel. One of the serious handicaps in the whole procedure was the fact that not only was the minority counsel not allowed to cross-examine witnesses, but we were denied the use of the committee staff, our own personal staff, and the technical assistance of the FBI.

I yield further to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand the Senator's answer, he did not furnish this background information to either the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. MCCARTHY. No; that is not correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did he or not?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Let me say to the very able Senator from Arizona that I am sure he will understand that if a lawyer is working on a case and has been preparing it for a long time, there is no

way on God's earth that he can effectively call in someone else to do the job of cross-examination for him and say, "Here, you cross-examine; I will give you the necessary information." Any information that I had was passed on to the minority members through Mr. Morris. But the Senator knows that that does not equip or qualify a man to cross-examine in a case on which I had been working for months. One of the members of the committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], whom I consider one of the ablest Senators, has had no legal training. It takes a pretty tough lawyer to make a man like Browder or Field talk. It cannot be done through written questions. The only reason in the world why the Senator from Wisconsin was not allowed to cross-examine was because someone was afraid of the facts. If those men were going to tell the truth, they did not have to be afraid of Senator MCCARTHY's cross-examination. The only reason MCCARTHY was denied the right to cross-examine was that someone was afraid of the facts.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I correctly understand the answer of the Senator, although he has not directly answered my question, he did not furnish the information personally to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The Senate and the world can judge of the ability of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa. I think they are able Senators and are experienced in cross-examination; but as to that, the Senate and the country can judge. The fact remains that the Senator from Wisconsin did not furnish his background information to them.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I will tell the Senator again that all information which I considered pertinent was discussed with the minority counsel. It was done in that fashion because I could not take the time of the Senators; I could not go to see them every day. All information which I considered important was passed on to them through their counsel.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator from Wisconsin aware of the fact that while much information was acquired by Mr. Morris, who was assistant counsel, recommended by the minority members, when he attempted to go around and about this part of the country to secure witnesses to prove or to attempt to prove the information which the Senator from Wisconsin had furnished him, the majority members of the subcommittee cut out the expense account of Mr. Morris, refused to pay him, and ordered him to cease such activities, namely, going around to pick up witnesses to prove what he wanted to prove in attempting to bring out the facts in connection with the allegations which the Senator from Wisconsin had said could be proved if the evidence were secured? As I understand, Mr. Morris has not received his expenses since March.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand he has never received his traveling expenses.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot say just when; but the committee refused to pay his expenses, has failed to pay them since sometime last March, and has told him to stop interviewing witnesses in connection with the very evidence which the Senator from Wisconsin said would prove the general matters in connection with the allegations.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no question about that. I want particularly to invite the attention of my very good friend from Arizona, who is in the majority leader's chair at this time, to the fact that the minority counsel, Mr. Morris, was given information by me and was also given leads, and when he went out to contact witnesses whom we felt should be brought before the committee, the majority members of the committee refused to pay the usual train fare and expenses to which any counsel is entitled, taking the position that Mr. Morris should do only what Mr. Morgan asked him to do.

I think we have all received a pretty good picture of the extent of the ability of Mr. Morgan as a whitewash artist, not only in this case but in the Pearl Harbor case.

In spite of that handicap, Mr. Morris did develop evidence under the leads which I gave him. Some he developed himself; some were given, I assume, by the minority members of the committee. He developed 25 or 30 witnesses whom he wanted called before the committee. I understand that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] asked that the hearings not be concluded and that those witnesses be called. They were important witnesses—witnesses who had valuable information on Communist infiltration in the State Department. The Tydings-McMahon half of the committee refused to permit the witnesses to be called.

May I ask the Senator from Iowa if that is not substantially correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There was no formal vote of refusal, but there was a failure to call those witnesses or to pursue the list of witnesses I had offered to produce for the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator. To answer the question of the Senator from Arizona more fully, not only were we denied the right to cross-examine witnesses but the right to call witnesses was denied. It is rather difficult to find any explanation of this action on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee when he said to the minority, "Even though there are 25 or 30 witnesses who can give valuable information as to traitors, Communists, and fellow travelers in our State Department, we shall refuse to call them, and will call only those witnesses who will tend to disprove the statements which the Senator from Wisconsin has made."

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us if he knows whether Mr. Morgan, who

presumably gave orders to Mr. Morris, had any connection with the Dean Acheson firm?

Mr. McCARTHY. I frankly do not know.

Mr. LANGER. From the speech of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], I understood Mr. Morgan had some connection, directly or indirectly, with that firm.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I recall the speech of the Senator from Indiana, I think he referred to a possible connection with the Seth Richardson-Joe Davies firm. I have not investigated anyone except the Communists and fellow travelers in the State Department. I did not take the trouble to check the background of the investigators. I know Mr. Morgan was with Seth Richardson as a member of the whitewash combine in the Pearl Harbor matter.

Mr. LANGER. In the speech of the junior Senator from Indiana he stated that the father-in-law of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee was also a member of the firm.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator may have misunderstood.

Mr. LANGER. I mean the firm of which Mr. Davies is a member.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, yes. Mr. Joe Davies is the father-in-law of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Morgan was either directly or indirectly connected with the Davies firm?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot express an opinion pro or con on that, because, frankly, I do not know. I have taken no time to investigate Mr. Morgan. I think he is a very good whitewash artist. He should be rewarded by the administration, and undoubtedly will be.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to prove the case of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the point which the Senator from Wisconsin is making, I think it is highly important to call attention to page 10818 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] inserted in the RECORD at that point several pages—I forget how many—

Mr. McCARTHY. Forty pages.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Massachusetts inserted 40 pages of the hearings before the subcommittee which had been deleted from the printed transcript of the hearings either by Mr. Morgan or the committee. Does the Senator recall reading at page 10818 the portion of the colloquy in which the Senator from Maryland is attempting to have the committee get out a report. I read as follows:

Senator TYDINGS. That is all right. I am willing to start on my report. What I would like to do is get it here and tell you what I am going to say, and if you don't agree with it, make one of your own, but I want a report on the work. I think our work is pretty well concluded, if you want my opinion.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I don't think it has even started, Mr. Chairman.

Senator TYDINGS. You disagree with me?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I disagree with you.

Senator TYDINGS. But I disagree with you, so there we are.

Mr. MORRIS—

Mr. Morris is the assistant counsel of the committee. He has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Iowa and also by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, may I mention just once case here?

Senator TYDINGS. Mr. Morris, we can mention cases from now until doomsday.

Mr. MORRIS. It is in the record, Senator. May I just finish?

Senator TYDINGS. Of course, you are not a member of the committee. When we want counsel to speak, we will ask them, but I am going to let you speak. However, that is a matter for the committee to decide.

Senator LODGE. I would like to hear what he has to say.

Mr. MORRIS. There is a case of a man named Theodore Geiger. He has been an employee of the State Department. He is now one of Paul Hoffman's top assistants. He is doing work that is quasi-State Department in character. I have gone and gotten some witnesses together who will testify that he was a member of the same Communist Party unit as they were, and I think that we would be delinquent if in the face of this evidence that is now on the record—

Senator TYDINGS. Why didn't you tell us this? Why did you wait until this hour to tell me?

Mr. MORRIS. I am not waiting Senator. One day Senator GREEN made me a witness and I put it all in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. You haven't told me about it. This is the first I have heard about it.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I assume that you are aware of everything in the record.

Senator TYDINGS. No. There are some things in the record I haven't been able to read.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly Mr. Morgan knows it. I have mentioned it several times to him.

The Mr. Morgan referred to here is the man who is whitewashing this investigation.

I shall not read further from the colloquy, because it is unnecessary to do so in order to prove the point made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa that here was the minority counsel who had introduced testimony that should have been investigated, but was not permitted to be investigated by the chairman. The important point is that when they printed the hearings they deleted 40 pages from the record. I say to the Senator that the Senator from Iowa has proved his point that he had no cooperation from the Senator from Maryland in trying to run down evidence which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin had furnished. Here is a case where the minority counsel went out and got evidence, it was introduced into the record, but the distinguished chairman of the committee did not even let it be brought to the attention of the members of the committee. Then he attempted to delete it from the record that comes to the Senate. It was done either by the committee or by Mr. Morgan. With the experience I have had with him, I would not put anything past Mr. Morgan. I will say that it was either Mr. Morgan or the committee, and that fact proves

the point made by the Senator from Iowa.

Finally the Senator from Maryland said:

Senator TYDINGS. Turn it over to the FBI or do something else with it. I would like to get a decision here. We don't want to waste this afternoon.

That was said by the chairman of the committee, who says his work is completed and there is no need for further investigation. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin if he knows who left out the 40 pages. Was it the chairman of the committee, the committee, or Mr. Morgan?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. Morgan?

Mr. McCARTHY. Morgan was in charge, but of course under the orders of Mr. TYDINGS.

Mr. WHERRY. At any rate, whoever left out the 40 pages is attempting to cover up evidence that was furnished by the minority counsel, who was deprived of submitting his evidence to the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. Undoubtedly someone on the staff or on the committee thought they would be able to keep it from the eyes of the public. The attempt seems so childish, because certainly it must have been evident that the Senator from Massachusetts would find that 40 pages of important testimony had been left out of the report of the hearings.

I may say for the Senator's benefit, in connection with Mr. Geiger, that the day after the President made the statement that there were no Communists in the Government, we received a telephone call from one of the men who were in the same Communist cell as Mr. Geiger. He stated that he was rather appalled to read the statement made by the President and that he would be glad to come down to testify. One gets so many tips that one does not always place too much stock in some of them. However, I asked Mr. Morris to check into it, and he did, and found the informant reliable. Incidentally that is one of the trips for which the committee will not pay his expenses. He developed, I think, either three or four witnesses who were in Mr. Geiger's Communist cell. They said, "We will come down and testify before the committee as to Mr. Geiger's communistic activities."

Mr. President, here is something that would be humorous, if it were not so tragic. A letter was written to one of the top officials of the ECA. The letter will be produced either here or in the House of Representatives. I believe it will be produced in the House. The official was asked if he would check on this man Geiger and he was told that we had this information about Geiger. Would the Senate like to know what the official's answer was? He wrote back and said, "I called Mr. Geiger in, I looked him straight in the eye, and I said, 'Mr. Geiger, are you a Communist?' Mr. Geiger said, 'No.' That ended his investigation."

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to belabor the point. However, the distinguished Senator from Iowa said that minority counsel had not been paid since March and that he had been told to take his orders from Mr. Morgan, which meant that he could not investigate evidence furnished by the Senator from Wisconsin. Is it not true that the committee, or Mr. Morgan, directed an investigation of the Senator from Wisconsin, and that they paid the transportation of the investigator to go to West Virginia and to Utah, trailing the Senator all around the country in an attempt to get evidence to smear the Senator from Wisconsin? I am sure that bill was paid.

Mr. McCARTHY. They sent their investigator to every hotel at which I had stayed on the trip. They got evidence as to where I stayed, and they got evidence as to the hotel room I occupied. Incidentally, they found that I had stayed alone. [Laughter.] They got affidavits from all the country. They went to Reno, and Las Vegas, Nev., Salt Lake City, and to West Virginia. The procedure followed was rather unusual. Perhaps a crowd of a thousand or so persons had heard my speech in West Virginia. The investigators went around and contacted a sizable number of the persons who had heard the speech and asked them, "Did McCARTHY say 57, or did he say 205?" If the prospective witness said I had mentioned 57, they said to him, "We don't want you." They then would go to the next person and ask him the same question. They were unable to find one person who had attended the meeting who would give them the answer they wanted. How many days and nights were spent in that investigation I do not know. If Mr. Morris had been willing to go out and investigate me, his expenses would have been paid.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that they were asking questions of the Senator's brothers and sister?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not a committee investigator. However, the President has had assigned to the White House—and I had not planned to go into this—for special duty two men for the purpose of trying to collate all the bad information they could get about me. Those men are paid by the taxpayers.

If they had only come to me, I could have helped them out. I know more about McCARTHY than does anyone else. I could tell them that McCARTHY does not claim to be either a great saint or a great sinner. I can give them all the information they want. But I doubt the correctness of spending public funds for an investigation of McCARTHY, unless and until the Senate directs such an investigation—not that I am worried about it.

Mr. President, it will be noted from the FBI report that this State Department official's wife lived with another woman

who according to the FBI was a member of the Communist Party and who openly admitted membership in the Communist Party. It will also be noted at the Loyalty Board hearing, which I shall later discuss, Mrs. X admitted that her two roommates were probably members of the Communist Party. One roommate was Mrs. Ades, the wife of the man who ran for Governor of Maryland on the Communist ticket, and who now lives in Baltimore. I note in my prepared remarks that the other works now in the Department of Agriculture. I stand corrected on that. The other roommate of this lady, who was named as a Communist Party member, so far as I can determine, is not in the Department of Agriculture today. She was there very recently. Whether she is in some other Government department I do not know.

We therefore have a case in which the FBI files show an important State Department employee admitting to an FBI undercover agent that he was a member of the Communist Party in Europe and in this country. We also find that this agent has been found completely reliable by the FBI over a period of years; that his job was to inform the FBI of the names of the members of the Communist Party and their activities. That was his task. We find his unqualified statement that both this State Department official and his wife were long members of the party and active therein, and that the wife was also active in the Young Communist League.

I call the attention of Senators to the dates on this report. They will find the report was submitted in September 1948. This was after the Eightieth Congress had adjourned, and it was about 8 months after the investigation by the House Committee on Appropriations, which was discussed by the Senator from Maryland the other day. Senators will note from this report that none of the investigations of the individual agents was conducted earlier than July 1948.

I merely mention these dates to show that the Senator from Maryland was again rather badly mistaken when he said that all these files were old files that had been investigated by the Eightieth Congress, and that for that reason, of course, they were valueless. This part of the files was produced after the Eightieth Congress had adjourned. I do not think that is important, except in view of the Senator's statement. I do not subscribe to the theory that a man is cleared merely because he has been previously investigated. I do not subscribe to the theory that if he was a Communist in 1946, 1947, and 1948 that is not important, and that it is only important if it is proved he is a Communist in 1950. We must take his entire background, running back for years, to find out how dangerous he is. That is why the file stripping in 1946 was such a great disservice to the country.

It would seem, therefore, that there could be no question whatsoever about the fact that here we have a clear-cut case of membership in the Communist Party by both a State Department official and his wife. There is other testimony in the file, testimony gathered by

a total of nine different special agents of the FBI. Much of the balance of the evidence, however, is largely opinion evidence. Some of it is favorable to Mr. X and some of it unfavorable. Most of it would be considered in a court as negative evidence, which courts and also committees, which have a working knowledge of the law, consider of little value as against positive testimony.

If one or two reputable witnesses testified that they actually saw John Brown committing a crime, it does not make much difference how many witnesses may come into court and say they did not see him commit it. I use that as an example. In this case we have a fellow member of the Communist Party working for the FBI who says, "I saw this State Department official at the Communist meetings. I know he joined." Against that there are some people who say, "We did not see him join. We do not know whether he is a member or not."

One of the other individuals named in this report as a member of the Communist Party is also working in the State Department. I have the 1950 telephone directory, and I am going to read the file I have in my hand very shortly. I see the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] present. I call his attention to the full report without names deleted and to the State Department telephone directory which shows that another individual named by the FBI as a Communist was working in the State Department as of January 1 this year, and I call attention to the fact that my staff called the State Department as of yesterday, and he was still working there.

Mr. President, I am forwarding this complete file to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in the hope that it may take note of what is disclosed. This does not indicate that I am not in sympathy with the desire of some of my colleagues to obtain the appointment of a bipartisan commission to investigate this subject further. However, I frankly do not have any hope whatsoever that there is any possibility of getting such a commission, because there would be danger that such a commission might make a fair inquiry, and if the administration wanted a fair inquiry, it could have been had. A committee could have been appointed here in the Senate which would have made such an inquiry. Therefore I am forwarding this file to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in the hope that they may do as excellent a job on this case as they did on Mr. Remington.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to the fact that we have here a clear-cut case of perjury, on several counts. Before the loyalty board, as appears on page 136 of the report of the investigation of the loyalty board, which I shall come to in a moment, this man testified that he was not then and never had been a member of the Communist Party.

I call the attention of the House committee to the fact that we have almost uncontradictable evidence that he was not only a member, but an active mem-

ber. So we here have a clear-cut case of perjury, and it seems that the most effective way of getting these Communists is to get them on charges of perjury.

There is also another count of perjury upon which this man could and should be indicted. That is this: His landlord made an affidavit to the effect that he and his wife had been living for some time with one well known Communist and another suspected of being a Communist. Their names are in the files I have handed to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. We find that this man lived for quite some period of time with this high State Department employee. Does the Senate note the significance of that? We have an affidavit to the effect that this State Department employee lived with a man who was a member of the Communist Party. When this State Department employee appeared before the loyalty board he testified that he knew this Communist "only recently" and "only casually."

Mr. President, let us now come to the picture of what happened when the FBI submitted this report. It was received in the Civil Service Commission in early September, and forwarded to the State Department. The State Department called for a loyalty board hearing. While the board, by a split decision, cleared him, it is rather interesting to note the reasoning followed by the members of the loyalty board. They followed the reasoning that if a Communist is clever enough so he can fool any of his coworkers, and they come in and say "We think he is loyal," then he should not be booted out. In other words, if he has been able to deceive his coworkers he should not be booted out. The board apparently operates on the theory that unless the accused wears a long beard and looks like a Communist is ordinarily painted, so that from that picture he would be labeled by everyone as being a Communist he should be cleared for Government service.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter written by a lawyer to the loyalty board. He was Dean Acheson's law partner. Dean Acheson's law firm represented this man before the loyalty board. This letter is interesting. Putting it mildly, it reveals a very disturbing situation. From this letter, it appears that the original loyalty board charge against this State Department official was that, "he acted in the interest of another government." That was the charge. In other words, that he was an espionage agent. However, after Mr. Acheson's law partner was hired, and before the hearing, this charge was dropped and a lesser charge made against him, namely, that he was a member of organizations cited by the Attorney General as coming within the purview of Executive Order No. 9825.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So that the record may be clear, can the Senator indicate

the date on which the law partner of the Acheson firm acted in behalf of this person?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to. I may say I do not know the date he was originally retained, but I can give the dates of some letters which indicate when he was active.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can the Senator give us approximately the date?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a letter dated September 17, 1948, from which I will quote. He was charged, (1) with belonging to the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, later known as the Civil Rights Congress, and (2) the Communist Party of America and in Europe. In other words, after Acheson's law partner came into the picture, they dropped the charge that he was serving another country.

The board also charged him with close association with eight known Communists. Note this. The board charged him with close association with eight known Communists including his own wife. He was charged with close association with his wife, who was a well known Communist. I have heard many things about the State Department, but I thought it was still proper over there to closely associate with one's wife. Whether he disproved that or not I do not know. But that was one of the charges.

Let me quote from this lawyer's letter—he was Attorney Westwood, incidentally, of Acheson's law firm—written to the loyalty board:

I am returning to you herewith a letter preferring charges which was sent to Mr.—

Naming the individual—

by mistake. This letter is dated September 17, 1948. It contains a charge that Mr.—

Naming the State Department official—

Acted in the interest of another government. When Mr. X—

We will call him Mr. X for the time being—

Inquired of you concerning this matter you referred him to Mr. Moreland. Subsequently on September 22, Mr. Moreland advised Mr. X that this letter was a mistake and requested its return in order that it might be destroyed.

In other words, by mistake, it named a State Department employee as a Communist spy. They did not learn of that mistake until Acheson's law firm got into the picture. Listen to this. The attorney said in his letter:

I am sure you can appreciate our concern that the first letter be destroyed, and we would appreciate your acknowledgment that the original of that letter (returned herewith)—

That is the original letter in which the first charge is made—

and we would appreciate your acknowledgment that the original of that letter (returned herewith) and all carbons have indeed been destroyed.

Mr. President, I can appreciate their concern about that. This, of course, is not the first time that the Acheson law firm has been successful in defending

State Department employees accused of communistic activities. For example, after Elizabeth Bentley had testified under oath that Lauchlin Currie was aiding her Soviet spy ring, Mr. Currie was represented before the House Committee on Un-American Activities by whom? By none other than the Red dean himself—Dean Acheson.

I might say in that connection, that while we do not have a complete list, we find that Acheson's law firm represented, and successfully in most of the cases, some 30 individuals accused of subversive activities and communistic connections. Do Senators note the significance of that? The law firm, the law partners of the boss of the State Department loyalty board, the law partners of the man who can hire and fire the members of that loyalty board, have appeared about 30 times in loyalty board hearings to defend men accused of communistic activities. And this case is one excellent example.

Alger Hiss was represented, not so successfully, before the House committee by John F. Davis. However, Davis stated to the committee that he was being assisted by Fontaine Bradley, another member of the Acheson law firm.

It is perhaps needless to comment upon the unusual circumstance of Mr. Acheson's law partner's success in having the charge against this man reduced, even though the FBI had produced a clear-cut, irrefutable, uncontradictable case against him, and as a result of the activities of Acheson's law firm that man is today, at this very moment, in the State Department in an important position.

Mr. President, as I previously stated in answer to some of my friends who have been asking when I intend to answer the committee's report, when I intend to answer the speech by the Senator from Maryland, I have no intention whatsoever of answering the committee's report or answering the Senator's speech. I am not going to indulge in a name-calling contest with them. This task is far too important for that. However, they will be answered by the production of facts from time to time.

The fact that the committee thinks this matter has been closed does not mean it has been closed. I say that so as to assure the people of the United States, the tens of thousands who have been writing to me, urging that we not succumb to the pressure being put on by the Democratic majority, but that we continue this investigation and persist in our efforts to get out of the State Department the individuals who are responsible for having American soldiers die today, if you please.

I shall have to admit that I do not think there is any great possibility of actually removing these men from the State Department, no matter how they are exposed. I assume that the man covered by this file probably will continue with the State Department, and probably will get a promotion, after the exposure. However, I feel that by means of the bright light put on their activities we have perhaps slowed them up. I think perhaps we have slowed up Mr. Latti-

more, the State Department's adviser and Mr. Acheson's good friend.

The Senate will recall that up until recently the State Department was following Lattimore's advice. The Senate will recall that on June 17 of last year Mr. Lattimore became so brazen that he quit giving secret advice, and in an article in the paper *Compass* bragged about the fact that in China the State Department had been successful in allowing China to fall to communism, and at the same time not letting it be known that we had pushed her. Those are the words of the State Department's adviser; those are the words of the man whom Acheson last August asked to submit a secret memorandum to guide Ambassador Jessup. Lattimore goes on to say—and this is a public statement—that now our problem in Korea is to do the same thing which the State Department did so successfully in China; that we should let South Korea fall to communism and sell the South Koreans into slavery, but not let the world know that we pushed her.

DOMINANT COMMUNIST CHINA-STATE DEPARTMENT GROUP

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Would Mr. Lattimore be a part of the group that evidently was referred to by Mr. Dulles at a luncheon meeting with Republican Senators—according to two different columnists—when he is reported to have said that a certain group in the ascendancy in the State Department thought a dose of communism would be good for Asia?

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator for that question. I do not believe I am violating any confidence when I quote what Mr. Dulles said at that meeting. I do not recall that there was any request that it be off the record. Was there?

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I should like to say that I was not at the particular meeting the Senator attended.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sorry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had attended one, 1 or 2 days previously, I think. However, it was my impression—and I merely wish to raise the point at this time—that it was an off-the-record meeting with Mr. Dulles, to discuss frankly with those on this side of the aisle some of the information which he had received as a result of his recent trip to the Far East.

Since there was no stenographic reporter present, we might not be doing a service to Mr. Dulles or to ourselves, unless we are very accurate in regard to the statements which were made. I know the Senator from Wisconsin would try to be; but I also know that we are getting into a field where there might be some misunderstanding. I merely mention that by way of general information.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

I say that I have not discussed that meeting, not knowing whether it was on or off the record. However, the newspapers have carried stories as to what occurred at the meeting.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada was repeating what columnists have said.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Which, as a matter of fact, since it has been made public both of us know to be accurate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. How the columnists got it is another story.

But inasmuch as it has been made public, I merely asked the question.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to make an observation. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin can exercise his own judgment in regard to this matter, but let me say that sometimes, as a result of meetings in the Armed Services Committee or some other committee, columnists may—by guesswork or otherwise—produce a story which may contain a part of what has taken place in the committee meeting. If by chance that should deal with security questions, information about which would be of value to the enemy, the fact that that was either officially confirmed or denied on the floor of the Senate of the United States by Senators who were there, would give other persons information which they necessarily would not have from perhaps a partially accurate report by columnists.

The Senator from Wisconsin, who has had long service for his country, both in the Marines and otherwise, of course is fully cognizant of the implications of having someone give either confirmation or denial to a speculative story.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say that I have no intention of discussing what was said by Mr. Dulles regarding a military situation in any area of the world.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In view of the fact that nothing about this has been stated on the floor of the Senate, or no report has been made here as to what happened, other than the statement by newspapermen that they thought a dose of communism would be good for China, and that since the Communists have since gained complete control of China, and also of North Korea, and in view of the fact that North Korea is on the move with the result that it requires a war on an all-out scale to remove them, it seems to me it is time that the subject is discussed on the Senate floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator, and I am inclined to discuss it.

Do I correctly understand that the Senator from California thought the meeting held on the previous day was off the record, and that Senators were not supposed to discuss it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I said, I did not attend the meeting the Senator from Wisconsin attended.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. However, I understand that there were two meetings, and

the only reason there were two was because the room would not accommodate all the Senators at the same time. The meeting to which I was invited with a large number of other Senators, and at which I understand substantially the same material was discussed, was an off-the-record meeting, so that Mr. Dulles could frankly discuss with the Members on this side of the aisle the situation in the Far East. That was certainly true so far as the meeting which I attended is concerned, which I think was 2 days ahead of the meeting which the Senator attended.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not so understand our meeting, but in view of the further fact that the Senator feels that that was the understanding at the previous meeting, I am going to ask unanimous consent—

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan came in late, having been at another meeting. The Senator from Michigan happened to be at both meetings. It was his understanding that only Mr. Dulles' talk was off the record, if that has any bearing. I heard the Senator from California state that he was at the first meeting, and that according to his understanding both meetings were off the record, although the Senator from Wisconsin has seen a column purporting to give a synopsis or really a statement of what took place at the meeting. But the Senator from Michigan understood it was off the record.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to thank the Senator. In view of the fact that it had been discussed rather freely in the press, I thought we could discuss it here, because it was such an important matter—a matter of life and death. However, under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent to have stricken from the RECORD any remarks which tend to give a picture of what occurred at this meeting with Mr. Dulles.

Mr. McMAHON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, regardless of what Mr. Dulles or anyone else said—I do not take any one man as my final authority on this subject—there is no doubt, there can be no possible doubt, that there was and still is within the State Department a group who feel that a dose of communism—that is, of Communist Government—would be a good thing for Asia. We followed Lattimore's advice in China; we followed Lattimore's advice in Korea, until a very, very late date. As the Senate knows, we voted a total of \$75,000,000, more than a year ago, in connection with the arms implementation program, to provide military assistance to the anti-Communist forces in Asia. Even though such assistance was voted almost unanimously, as I recall, by the Senate and House, and although the law was signed by the President without a word of protest, the State Department under that group of untouchables, that group who think that a dose of communism or Communist Government is good for some

countries, have succeeded in making sure that not one ounce of gunpowder, not one bullet would reach the only major anti-Communist arm in the east, which is the army of Chiang Kai-shek.

Then, later, the Senate voted the sum of \$27,600,000 for Korea, Iran and the Philippines. \$10,300,000, as I recall, was set aside for military aid to South Korea. That was done last year. As the Senate will recall, that action again was almost unanimous. The President signed the law without a word of protest. Then what happened? Why did not South Korea get tanks? Why did she not get guns? Why did she not get airplanes? Why, after \$10,000,000 was appropriated by the Senate, do we find that only \$200 was actually spent? That was spent in connection with some wire which has not arrived in Korea yet.

SEVENTH FLEET ORDERED TO STOP NATIONALIST CHINA'S INTERFERENCE WITH ENGLAND'S SHIPPING WAR SUPPLIES TO COMMUNIST CHINA

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator connect the order given to the Seventh Fleet of the United States to prevent Nationalist China from interfering with the commerce or in any way interfering with the Communist Government on the mainland of China, with the fact that that would prevent the Nationalist Government from interfering with or stopping or attempting to stop the normal trade relations between England and Communist China, to which England admittedly, until a few days ago, was shipping petroleum?

Finally, under great pressure of public sentiment here and elsewhere, the shipment of petroleum was stopped—at least, it was so stated—but England is still continuing to send fabricated and manufactured goods into Communist China, which action is in reality keeping the Communists supplied with material which they can send, as they undoubtedly are doing, to North Korea, which material can be used in the war against American boys and girls now in Korea. This commerce is continuing, and our Seventh Fleet has orders to stop the Nationalists from interfering with the regular business of the Communists—is it in our interest to protect England in shipping war supplies to our enemies?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator raises a good point. He refers to that part of the Presidential order to the Seventh Fleet, ordering it to make sure that Chiang Kai-shek's forces take no military action against the mainland.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator knows, this part of the order was the brainchild of Dean Acheson. As the Senator will recall, when it was suggested that we aid Formosa to prevent the creation of an entire Red Pacific, Dean Acheson at that time referred to it as a "silly venture." That was the day, the Senator will recall, that he referred to the Communist victories in China as "the dawning of a new day." So he has been adamant in attempting to prevent any aid to Formosa. When

the President made the about-face and said, "We will send the Seventh Fleet to prevent an invasion of Formosa," then the Acheson crowd, while temporarily defeated, and while temporarily thrown into confusion, began to work. They succeeded in getting an order preventing Chiang in any way from interfering with the commerce of Red China. What effect has that had? The Senator spent considerable time in World War I as a combat engineer. Combining his background of experience with the news which is coming in today, the Senator knows that one of the reasons for the previous inability of the Communists to invade the island stepping stones to Formosa has been due to the fact that Chiang's air force has been able to keep the Communists from congregating enough small shipping and marshaling their forces on the mainland. So what we actually have today because of that Acheson order is that we have the Seventh Fleet protecting the Communists so that they can concentrate their forces and marshal their shipping along the coast.

The results are already becoming apparent. The Senator has read in the press that the Communists are starting an all-out attack on some of the island stepping stones to the mainland. What will happen? What will happen when Chiang's forces start to protect, through air action, their island defenses? I do not know.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. But that part of the order was a tremendous service to the Communists in China. If, of course, the Seventh Fleet stays there and actually makes an all-out attempt to protect Formosa, that will more than offset the temporary advantage which the Communists are today getting along the shore.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. We would naturally expect, inasmuch as there has been war between the Communists, sponsored by Russia, according to our own administration, and the Nationalists, and they have now won in China and have established their government in China, that naturally, they would make war on any island they thought would be advantageous to them. We would expect that.

OUR ALLIES FURNISHING WAR SUPPLIES TO COMMUNISTS

The thing which we normally would not expect is that our ally, England, would continue normal trade in fabricated and manufactured goods necessary to keep the troops in Korea supplied with such goods not available elsewhere, and that, further, we would order the Seventh Fleet not to allow Chiang Kai-shek to interfere with such shipments.

Does the Senator understand that is what is happening, with normal trade necessary to supply the front line army and the army behind the lines?

Mr. McCARTHY. As I followed the Senator's question, this is his position, that one of the things the Chiang air

force was doing was to prevent the flow of British oil into areas where it could be used to keep the tanks of the North Koreans operating. I think it is fully admitted that British oil was keeping those tanks running. Up to the time the Seventh Fleet was ordered to prevent Chiang Kai-shek from operating between Formosa and the mainland, he was accomplishing the stoppage of at least a part of the volume of British oil. I gather the Senator's position is that since the order to the Seventh Fleet there is no one to blockade the Communist forces and to keep out the British oil which they are using in their tanks.

Mr. MALONE. That is the position. We now understand that England has stopped, at least temporarily, the shipping of petroleum into the Communist area, but she is continuing to ship fabricated goods which the Senator knows, from his experience in the Marine Corps in World War II, are absolutely indispensable to keep an army on the march. So we would expect our normal enemies to gain more ground, but we would hardly expect the particular ally, to whom we are furnishing \$1,500,000,000 a year to create industry in their own countries, to ship manufactured and processed goods direct to Russia and to the iron-curtain countries, which are no doubt finding their way to Korea or wherever they are needed, with our allies' trademarks still on the goods. It is hardly understandable, to put it mildly.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator. I wish to say, not in specific answer to his question, but with reference to the general situation, that I believe any fair-minded man, any man of average intelligence, who has a bit of horse sense, will admit that so long as the Acheson crowd is in the State Department, they will attempt to sabotage every effort we make to stop communism in Asia. As Lattimore said, "Let them fall, but do not let it appear that we pushed them." That is why the Red Dean and others make speeches against communism in general, while at the same time thrusting the dagger into the back of all anti-Communists in the East. They either do not realize what they are doing—and I do not think that is possible—or else they are trying to create a Red Asia and a Red Pacific Ocean which will wash our western shores.

OUR ALLIES ASSIST COMMUNIST CHINA-RUSSIA
AND IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I gladly yield.

Mr. MALONE. Why confine it to China? For 2½ years we have furnished to the 16 Marshall-plan countries goods, industrial equipment, and money to better equip them for industrial production.

On March 4, 1948, the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD one treaty made by England with Russia covering the equipment being furnished Russia, and there are now 96 trade treaties between the 16 Marshall-plan countries and Russia, and the iron-curtain countries, furnishing them everything conceivable that would be needed to fight world war III. Why confine it to China?

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, at this time I have several documents which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, to appear at the conclusion of my remarks. One of them is an editorial from my home-town paper, the Appleton Post Crescent.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. With reference to what the Senator from Wisconsin has said regarding shipments to southern Korea, I should like to ask him whether he has made any study of the possible relationship of W. K. Remington and those associated with him with regard to shipments or the withholding of shipments to southern Korea. My reason for asking the question is that when the junior Senator from South Dakota was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, somewhat over 2 years ago, and the committee was going into the case of Remington, we found him at that time in the Department of Commerce in the strategic position of determining what kind of military equipment and machine tools should be exported from the United States to Russia. Subsequently, as the Senator will recall, he was removed from the Department of Commerce, then cleared by the loyalty board, and reemployed by the Department of Commerce. So I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin has explored the possibility that the little cell he established there might be responsible for the withholding of military aid which for eight long months failed to reach Korea after being appropriated for by the Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have made no detailed study of it, because that was impossible; but one of the reasons why I named Remington in the list of 81 persons was because he was working so closely with the State Department. I think it would be impossible for me, without the power of subpoena, to tie down the specific individuals who were responsible for the sabotage. But, certainly, it was that small group in the Department of Commerce and in the State Department.

Incidentally, I want to invite attention to the fact that the State Department official whose file was given the Senate today is working on the question of exports to Russian satellite nations.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator will yield further, when the House Committee on Un-American Activities originally went into the Remington case, he was at that time largely engaged in authorizing the shipment of grinding tools and machine tools to Russia, which at that time was Russia's most conspicuous weakness. He was associated with a former resident of the great State of Wisconsin—an unfrocked preacher from Wisconsin. The situation became so bad that a labor union in Rochester, N. Y., went on strike and refused to manufacture armaments for Russia then being authorized for

shipment by these two characters in the Commerce Department, who were later cleared by the loyalty board, as a prelude to being indicted by the grand jury.

I was wondering whether in his careful investigation of this case the Senator from Wisconsin had been able to determine why it was that for eight long months these shipments were withheld from the South Koreans. There must have been a studied effort on the part of someone. It could not have merely happened. It could not be merely an example of Government red tape or bureaucratic lethargy. It would seem to me to have been a deliberate effort on the part of someone to deny to the South Koreans the equipment which they need so badly today. It was equipment which Congress had voted in October and which the Koreans had not received in any degree at all up to June. Could the Senator from Wisconsin shed any light on that sordid chapter of American history?

Mr. McCARTHY. The only light I can shed on it is that when the Acheson crowd in the State Department, with their friends in the Commerce Department, decide that aids which Congress votes are not going to get to certain nations, they simply do not get there. However, the situation has existed longer than 8 months. We have an example of it in Formosa. Congress voted \$75,000,000 for aid to Formosa, over the opposition of Mr. Acheson, who said it was a silly venture. However Acheson had the last word. Congress appropriated \$75,000,000, and the President signed the bill, but Mr. Acheson's crowd had the last word. Because of their efforts not one penny's worth of material got to Formosa. I cannot pin it down to any one individual. It is the group to whom I have referred.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator from Wisconsin aware of the fact that when the first Marshall aid program was authorized the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I was a member, over the vigorous protest of the Department of State wrote a new title into the bill providing aid for what was then Nationalist China, and that in conference between the Senate and House conferees of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs committees, on which the junior Senator from South Dakota sat, representative of the State Department protested vigorously against that type of aid. However, the Senate receded and the position of the House was sustained. The bill as passed contained the so-called Chinese title. Despite the fact that Congress had again spoken, this time with respect to giving military and economic aid to Nationalist China, that aid was also withheld deliberately by someone in the State Department, and it failed to reach Chiang Kai-shek until he was practically on his last legs and almost ready to evacuate the mainland and proceed to Formosa. Is the Senator aware of that sequence of events?

That is not mere happenchance. The American public has not been told the whole story. It has not been told that deliberately time after time aid which had been voted by Congress over the opposition of the State Department was

withheld and not delivered either to Nationalist China, Formosa, or Southern Korea.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator for his remarks. The public will never be told so long as committees like the Tydings-McMahon committee are assigned to the job of digging out the facts. I was tremendously disturbed, surprised, and disappointed by what I saw and heard on the floor of the Senate last Thursday. The task of digging out Communists, traitors, and saboteurs should not be the task of any political party. It should not be the task of either the Republicans or the Democrats. It is a job for all Americans. From the moral support, the letters, and encouragement which I have received from Democrats throughout the country it seems to me that those loyal Democrats should have deserved something better than what we saw on the floor of the Senate last week. I thought perhaps that at least one Democratic Senator—at least one—would stand up and be counted and say, "I am not going to put myself into the Tydings-McMahon-Morgan group." I was very happy to see that some Democratic Senators at least did not have the stomach to come here and take part in what went on. We saw a most unfortunate spectacle last week—unfortunate not only for the Democratic Party, but for the Nation. For the first time we saw the Democratic Party line up solidly and effectively label itself as the party of betrayal and the party that protects Communists in Government. I am sure the American people will take note of that. That was not done by the Republican Party. It was done by no one except the Democratic Party itself. I say that does not represent the thinking and feeling of the vast number of loyal long-time Democrats throughout the country.

I may be getting away from the Senator's question, but I thought that fact should be made clear. For example, I do not believe the story will ever be told why the South Koreans, when this war started, had not been given a single tank, a single antitank gun, or a single airplane, except some old AT-6's. The story will never be told why they had not been given any help after Congress, following considerable discussion, had decided that it was in the interest of this country to defend South Korea. I do not think it will ever be explained why American soldiers had to go in there literally with bare hands to do a job which they would not have had to do had not Acheson and his crowd in the State Department sabotaged what we attempted to do. The Congress decided that we should give South Korea some of the planes, tanks, and guns, because it was in our interest to do so. However, the State Department and the Commerce Department said, "No, not 1 cent of it will pass."

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator agree that if that had happened only in South Korea, we could charitably charge it off to the lack of experience of perhaps good-intentioned but bungling men who were not fit for their jobs? However, when it follows in close sequence and exact replica what happened in For-

mosa, which also followed in close sequence and exact replica what happened in Nationalist China, the American public cannot help but conclude that someone planned it that way. Whether it was planned by men of poor judgment, whether it was planned by men of stubborn mind, or whether it was planned by men of disloyal purposes, it seems to me the American public has a right to know why they planned it. They have a right to know because one of the results is a bloody war in far-off Korea, which we must now win in order to save the world from communism.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator wholeheartedly. It was not merely the one case of Korea, but all of that area of the world. Our batting average in Asia is zero. The batting average of the Soviet Union is 1.000 percent.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

A PATTERN OF POLICIES TIES STATE AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS TOGETHER

Mr. MALONE. The delay in the shipments of gasoline to Nationalist China was the subject of a resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada. The purpose of the resolution was to provide for an investigation of the Commerce Department and certain persons in the employ of the Department who apparently were directly responsible for the delay.

Mr. Liebermann, whose name is now Mr. Lee—and who, incidentally, although on sick leave, still is the Director of the Far Eastern Division of the Department of Commerce when there was a 3-to-6-month delay in the gas shipments to Nationalist China during the crucial 1948 period. The funds for 125,000 barrels of gas and other supplies had been made available by Congress. The delay was so protracted during this period that General MacArthur, out of his meager supplies of gas in 1948, furnished Chiang Kai-shek gas—while for one reason or another they were holding it up in the Department of Commerce. One of the reasons was that they wanted the detailed size of the gas storage tanks in China, the number of troops, number of planes, and so forth, all information which the Reds wanted but which was not needed in order to make it possible to ship gasoline in accordance with the congressional act.

Mr. Gladieux, who occupies a high position in the Department of Commerce, appeared before our committee in connection with the Lee-Liebermann case and endeavored to support his actions in China shipments.

After the junior Senator from Nevada made his statement before the committee, Mr. Sawyer discharged Mr. Remington and Mr. Lee. Mr. Remington has since been indicted by the grand jury. Mr. Lee is still hanging on.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me correct the Senator. Mr. Sawyer did not discharge Mr. Lee. Mr. Sawyer asked Mr. Lee to resign.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. And Mr. Lee told Mr. Sawyer to go to hell.

Mr. MALONE. I accept the correction; but he is on sick leave now. We have made progress.

What I wanted to say was that the junior Senator from Nevada drew a pattern of action before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the pattern is clear. The Lattimore letter fitted in, namely, that we must lose China and lose Korea. Then we proceeded to lose them through another department, at least it could be called an assist. Wherever we find one of these people, it seems to be like a hill of potatoes: If we get one, we get three or four or five others in the same department, all cooperating and supporting and recommending each other.

Further, Mr. President, I ask the junior Senator from Wisconsin, would he believe that the evidence of Mr. Gladieux in violently defending Mr. Lee and Mr. Remington and others under suspicion fits him to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should say that in the eyes of the present administration, apparently, yes. In my eyes, no. I am sure the Senator does not think so.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, I understand he was slated to be Assistant Secretary of the Department of Commerce until this hearing was held, but the appointment is temporarily delayed now until the fire dies down, if it does die down; but the junior Senator from Nevada has no idea of letting it die down. He is simply correlating further evidence.

The hearing is, however, stalled in a democratically controlled committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. The junior Senator from Nevada performed a tremendous service for the country when he exposed Michael Lee in the Department of Commerce.

In further answer to the question which the Senator from South Dakota asked in regard to Remington, I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that Remington was found to be O. K. not only by the Seth Richardson loyalty board, but the Tydings-McMahon committee found that there was no evidence of disloyalty, no evidence that he was a Communist, and no evidence that he was a pro-Communist. I think that should be clear.

The Tydings-McMahon committee also found, insofar as this individual, whose FBI file I have here, is concerned, that there was no evidence of disloyalty, no evidence that he is a Communist—listen to this—no evidence that he is a Communist, no evidence that he is a pro-Communist, even though we have a complete FBI report showing that he was a member of the Communist Party, not only in this country—this man was born in Moscow—but that he was a member of the Communist Party in Europe; that he admitted this to the FBI agent whom he considered to be a fellow Communist at the time the FBI agent was working under cover as a member of the Communist Party.

It was found by the McMahon-Tydings committee that there was no evidence that this man was a Communist, no evidence that he was a pro-Communist, no evidence of disloyalty. They did not single the cases out separately, but took the whole 81 as one.

I thought the Senator would be interested in knowing that even though a grand jury has indicted a man for perjury in connection with his communistic activities, the report which was prepared after the indictment still says that there is no evidence of his being a Communist or a pro-Communist.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator aware of the fact that Mr. Gladieux, of the Department of Commerce, testified before the Committee on Appropriations of the House, I believe in April of this year, that there were 28 known dangerous risks in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sorry; I did not catch the question.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator aware of the fact that Mr. Gladieux, who was formerly considered as material to be appointed as Assistant Secretary of Commerce, testified before the appropriations subcommittee of the House—I believe in April 1950—that there are 28 known dangerous security risks in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am aware of that. But let me say that the Department of Commerce cannot as easily get rid of those risks as can the State Department. The State Department is covered by the McCarran rider, which gave the Secretary of State the right to discharge those risks instantaneously. The Secretary of Commerce, the Senator will recall, asked Michael Lee to resign, and Lee thumbed his nose at him. In fairness to the Secretary of Commerce, I should say he did not have the complete, unlimited power which the Secretary of State had. But I am aware of the fact that we do have those bad risks in the Department. Those risks, I understand, all had formerly gotten loyalty board clearance.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. At least Mr. Lee had a clearance from the board, and I understand Mr. Remington had also. As I recall Mr. Alger Hiss also had clearances from the controlled loyalty boards—he has since been found guilty by a jury.

The Senator is perfectly aware of the fact—or is he?—that whatever the Congress may do, the State Department and the Department of Commerce, working together can defeat, the Department of Commerce being the department which handles the shipments and the final disposition of materials which are purchased by the money appropriated by Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not only can, but have done so.

Mr. President, I should like now to read an article which may sound unusual at first. It is in high praise of the Tydings-McMahon committee. I should like to read it into the Record. It says:

Something very unusual but not unwelcome occurred last week in the Senate. The

sworn testimony of a professional stool-pigeon was discredited, rejected, and repudiated by the formal actions of a Senate subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of the Senate as a whole.

I may say, before reading it, that this article deals with the committee's treatment of Mr. Budenz. It praises the committee to the skies. I think that before completing reading it I should mention the fact that I am reading from the Daily Worker, the official Communist publication. I think it is well that someone is saying something good about the McMahon-Tydings committee, so I am going to read portions of this article into the Record. It proceeds:

Interest grows, of course, when one realizes that the professional stool pigeon was Louis Francis Budenz, whose eager lies have been so helpful to the Justice Department in its drive against Communists and progressives.

It can be seen his testimony hurt. One of the reasons why I am putting this into the Record is that I want the Senate to compare the Daily Worker's language used in condemning Mr. Budenz with the language of the report of the committee.

Prosecutor McGohey relied heavily on the tortuous fabrications of Budenz in his case against the 11 Communist leaders. Judge Medina took pains that the jury should give it great weight. In the opinion of newsmen covering the trial, the testimony of Budenz was the lever by which the prosecution pried a guilty verdict from the jury.

It was the more or less unsupported word of Budenz which brought a jail sentence for Harold Christoffel, the Milwaukee labor leader. And during the last couple of years, few noncitizens have been ordered deported for their political views without the gloat participation of Louis Francis Budenz.

The article proceeds to point out that the Government would have been unsuccessful in deporting or convicting Communists if it had not been for Louis Francis Budenz.

Then they point out that the committee has done a tremendous service to the country in finally taking care of this man Budenz so that his testimony cannot be used in the future to convict other equally dangerous Communists. They apparently think the committee has done a brilliant job in applying the smear brush to Budenz so thoroughly that never again can his testimony be used to deport other dangerous Communists as it has been deported in the past. I recommend this Daily Worker article for the reading of Senators at the same time they read the committee report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the end of my remarks. I trust it may be the last time I will ask that a Daily Worker article be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to have placed in the Record a number of editorials, as follows:

An editorial from the Appleton Post-Crescent entitled "So Here Is How It Stands," under date of July 22, 1950; an editorial entitled "The Report Nobody Believes," from the Washington Times-

Herald of July 19, 1950; an editorial entitled "Green Lights for the Reds" from the Shreveport Times of July 19, 1950; an editorial entitled "A Shameful Performance," from the Los Angeles Examiner; an editorial entitled "Whitewash, Pitch in Odd Mixture," from the Dallas Morning News of July 19, 1950; an editorial from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of July 19, 1950, entitled "Convenient Whitewash."

Another editorial entitled "'Whitewash' of Red Charges," from the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 21, 1950; an editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer of July 19, 1950, entitled "Buckets of Whitewash"; an editorial entitled "The Whitewash," published in the Illinois State Journal of July 21, 1950, an editorial from a Dallas, Tex., newspaper whose name I do not have, entitled "No Mood To Forget"; an editorial "Owen Lattimore, Self-Revealed," from the Arizona Daily Star of July 18, 1950, an editorial entitled "Smellier and Smellier," from the Indianapolis Times of July 30, 1950.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials may be printed in the body of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from Life magazine entitled "Johnson or Acheson." I am very happy to insert this editorial from Life magazine because of its indication that the men controlling the editorial policy of Life are big enough to admit mistakes and change.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record. (See exhibit 4.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I also have in my hand an article from the July 17, 1950, issue of Time magazine. The article is entitled "The United States Tragedy in Formosa," and is written by John Osborne, Time-Life senior correspondent in the Far East. Much as I hate to take the Senate's time, I think this article is important enough to read into the Record. It is not very lengthy but is extremely important. Here is a magazine which certainly has not been considered friendly to the efforts to remove the Communists from government, a magazine which certainly has not been friendly toward our attempt to expose what Acheson and his clique have been doing in the Far East. That, I believe, makes this article doubly significant. I should like to read it into the Record. It will take me but a few moments to do so. I read as follows:

John Osborne, Time-Life senior correspondent in the Far East, visited the Formosan capital of Taipei last week, cabled:

"This capital teems with testaments to the tragic miscalculations and near-fatal results of United States policy toward the Chinese Nationalists and Formosa. The visible, jarring fact is that the United States has created a situation which now makes it well-nigh impossible to sustain any effective position whatever on and toward Formosa. If the miscalculations of the State Department

are retrieved, it will be only because Formosa's Nationalists, in their extremity, are able and willing to make retrieval possible.

"The full import of the United States State Department's attitude toward the Chinese Nationalists in recent months is measurable only in terms of the Nationalists' political position on Formosa. If this position was understood by the State Department, the State Department stands convicted of the deliberate sabotage of the Chinese government; if this position was not understood, the State Department stands convicted of avoidable ignorance.

"Blind and stubborn. On Formosa, as in every other part of Asia, United States pronouncements are read with extraordinary attention; they eventually reach even the illiterate masses. And the State Department has blindly and stubbornly insisted on the maximum distribution of official American statements that were bound to undermine the Formosans' confidence in their government."

Listen to this, Senators:

"On more than one occasion, Formosa's Nationalists have sharply and justifiably reminded the puny United States representation here that the statements of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and other Washington spokesmen constituted a direct attack on a government which was, after all, host to the very Americans in charge of disseminating these statements throughout Formosa.

"The results of this almost incredible situation have not been catastrophic for two reasons: (1) Chiang Kai-shek's present government is definitely better in performance and public relations than any Chinese Nationalist Government since the mid-1930's; (2) a bumper rice crop this year has made rural Formosans feel pretty good and allayed discontent that might otherwise have been stimulated by American statements.

"Crowning irony: The crowning irony came this week when Nationalist Spokesman Shen Chang-huan felt constrained to dispel at least part of the heavy fog surrounding President Truman's statement on Formosa. Said Shen in a statement to the Chinese press: 'I believe the United States has no territorial ambitions on Formosa.' It was a statement that any local United States spokesman might have been expected to make, but of course none did. Any local United States diplomat who said anything reassuring to the Chinese Government would have expected to lose his job."

Let me repeat that, Mr. President:

"Any local United States diplomat who said anything reassuring to the Chinese Government would have expected to lose his job.

"It makes no sense for the United States to reverse its concept of Formosa's strategic importance and at the same time cling stubbornly to the old, down-the-nose political attitude toward Formosa's Nationalist Government. Yet so far as I can judge here, this is precisely what the United States State Department is undertaking to do. I can state as fact that no instructions to modify or alter in any way our political, diplomatic, and military relations with the government of this island have been received by United States representatives here."

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, where there appears, starting on the first page, a copy of a letter which I addressed to the President of the United States under date of July 13 and a copy of his reply of acknowledgment of July 14. In my

letter I pointed out that I felt that with the changed situation the Government of the United States should be represented at Taipei, which is the temporary capital of the Republic of China, by an Ambassador rather than the present consul general who is there. I respectfully suggested to the President that one possibility, as an Ambassador, and a man who is well acquainted with that area of the world and with the Soviet aspirations in that area of the world, was Mr. Angus Ward, who was held a prisoner by the Communists at Mukden for a considerable period of time. In any event, of course, the one who is selected will be chosen by the President of the United States himself.

However, certainly there is on the island of Formosa—which I visited last November and December—the largest force of non-Communist combatant troops in that area of the world. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact—although I am sure he already knows it—that the first member nation of the United Nations to respond wholeheartedly to the appeal for aid in meeting this Communist aggression was the Republic of China, located on Formosa, which offered some three divisions of 30,000 men and 20 C-46 planes. That Government was not only the only member of the Security Council, aside from the Government of the United States, to offer ground forces, but until quite recently it was the only member of the United Nations to offer any ground forces, and up to this very moment it is the member of the United Nations which has offered the largest number of ground forces, other than the United States of America.

I also wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin, or at least to remind him of the fact, that had it not been for the vote of the representative of the Republic of China in the Security Council on the second and the third resolutions, which require, by virtue of the Charter of the United Nations, seven votes in order to carry, the second and the third resolutions would not have been adopted, or at least, would not have been adopted without some additional delay, which might have resulted in the overrunning of all Korea.

I think the Senator has made a very good point. This Government does have some responsibility in this matter. Even as we meet here today, as I pointed out yesterday, the island of Quemoy, otherwise known as Kinmen, is about to come under amphibious assault. Heretofore it was thought that perhaps the Republic of China was foreclosed from reinforcing that island. However, it is my opinion that that is not the case, but that the Government of the Republic of China is free to give such reinforcement to the island of Quemoy or Kinmen as is necessary.

Certainly it would be a great mistake, in my judgment, to permit the island of Quemoy to fall to the Chinese Communists; because if it does fall to them it will be a stepping stone to the island of Formosa.

I wish to say now—and I intend to take it up in both the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee—that I do not believe we should get caught in Formosa as we were in Korea. I believe that the Government of the United States should have in Korea today a commission finding out what additional ammunition and what additional artillery and what additional tank equipment they need, so that if there is an assault against the island of Formosa, the Chinese forces there—some 500,000 men, under the very able leadership of Gen. Sun Leh Jen, a graduate of Virginia Military Institute, and a very able leader, just as Gen. Hu Lien, on the island of Kinmen, is a very competent commander—will have the necessary material with which to defend themselves. They are willing to defend the free way of life, as against communism, having had considerable experience with what communism means when it overruns a country.

So I do not believe we should sit back and wait until Formosa itself is under amphibious assault before we get the ammunition and the other materials which we need to get to that island.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator from California will agree with me that if the Communists are successful in overrunning Kinmen, one of the reasons why they will be successful is the existing order which the President of the United States gave to the Seventh Fleet, which provided that they would protect the mainland and its approaches from any air attacks by Chiang Kai-shek. I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that until that order went into effect, Chiang Kai-shek had been effectively bombing the attempted concentration of small boats in preparation for the invasion of Kinmen. However, since that order has been in effect, Chiang Kai-shek's air force has not been able to attempt to break up the marshaling of troops on the mainland and the concentration of small shipping in preparation for the invasion of Kinmen.

I am sure the Senator will agree with me that that order certainly should be given close scrutiny by the President of the United States at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I think that undoubtedly is true; and that order does make more difficult the defense of Kinmen Island or the defense of Formosa itself, by permitting the accumulation of amphibious craft to carry an invading force to either of those islands.

However, I think the record should be clear that, as I understand, there is no restraint on the Government of the Republic of China in regard to reinforcing the island of Kinmen, which apparently is soon to come under attack; at least, so far as movements from Formosa to Kinmen Island are concerned, they will not be interfered with by the United States Seventh Fleet.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that; but I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the mere sending of troops to Kinmen, coupled with a denial of the right to bomb and break up the concentration of Communist forces along the

shore, is of but little help to the Government of the Republic of China. So long as we prevent Chiang's forces from bombing the concentration of Communist forces, which apparently are prepared or are preparing to invade that island, we are performing a great service for and are giving great help to the Communists. So long as we say that Formosa is of strategic importance and that we must protect it—which means, of course, that we must protect it with the Seventh Fleet and perhaps air forces—and if there is an attempted invasion of Formosa, many of our boys will die because Chiang Kai-shek has been prevented by us from using his air force to bomb and break up the Communist forces which are preparing to invade Formosa. I am sure the Senator from California will agree with me in regard to that point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree; and I am sure that any order preventing the Republic of China from sending its air force to bomb the Communist forces which are preparing to invade Kinmen or Formosa should be canceled. I think that some conditions which previously prevailed in connection with the invasion of South Korea, made it desirable that another front not be opened up, in connection with China. However, certainly the action to be taken against invading fleets should be left to the discretion of the Government of China, which temporarily is located on the island of Formosa.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, continuing with the article from which I was reading—

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, we have been rather lenient, and have not objected to the making of speeches by other Senators in connection with the matter the Senator from Wisconsin is discussing. We have not objected to interruptions.

Mr. President, I am going to have to demand the regular order from now on, and I simply wish to give that notice.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the Senator, and appreciate the fact that he has been patient up to this time.

Mr. President, I read further from the article entitled "The United States Tragedy in Formosa":

The prevailing American attitude is that any help to Formosa, military or economic (beyond the present ECA program), would be a mistake because it would build up the Nationalist Government, again identify the United States Government with it, and thereby contribute to the Nationalist return to the mainland so ardently opposed by our State Department.

All here, including the responsible Chinese I have so far seen, realize that this is no time to rake up the past for recriminations' sake. But all here also realize that this past has created problems to be dealt with now—and to be dealt with by United States officials whose attitudes and capacities, for the most part, can only be measured by the recent past.

Close call: Consider the United States position on Formosa after Truman's statement: the senior United States representative was Consul General and Chargé d'Affaires Robert Strong, a State Department career man of

modest reputation. The senior military representative was an Army lieutenant colonel assisted by a staff of three other officers and barely enough enlisted men to answer phones, drive staff cars. Not one of the military men had the rank or authority to provide the liaison so urgently required with the United States Seventh Fleet.

Last week an incident symbolized the lack of contact between United States officials here and the Nationalist government.

Six United States planes appeared over Formosa's west coast. They were reported as strange aircraft because the Nationalists had not been informed that they were coming. Nationalist fighters took off to intercept them. A moment before they would have opened fire, they recognized the United States markings on the planes. At Tainan, where the American planes came in to land, Nationalist ack-ack crews learned only at the last minute, and then from their own pilots, that the "strange" planes were American. Had the identification come a few seconds later, the crews would have fired on the United States planes.

Most responsible Chinese here are fully aware that Washington and the Seventh Fleet have a war on their hands and other things than Formosa to think about. Nevertheless, they have reasonably requested clarification here and in Washington of Truman's rather cryptic cease-fire orders to Chinese forces, and with notable patience and forbearance have tried to learn what is expected of them by the Seventh Fleet.

Just relax: In the early course of these inquiries, the Chinese were told in all seriousness that there would be no problem of communication or plane identification since the Seventh Fleet would stay completely away from Formosa. Incredible Chinese officials pointed out that planes from a United States carrier would surely at some time or other approach the Formosan coast. What if a United States plane were in trouble far from its carrier—would it ditch at sea rather than land on Formosa? The American attitude remained: you boys just relax, you'll never see Seventh Fleet ships or planes.

The questions Formosa's Nationalists most urgently want answered are these:

Does Truman's ban on "mainland operations" include aerial reconnaissance?

Does the United States ban on further naval blockade mean that the Nationalists may not watch, search and seize Chinese ships carrying supplies from Hong Kong to the mainland? If so, will the Americans take their own measures to prevent the supply of the Chinese Communists—and the North Koreans—via the mainland?

Does the blockade prohibition further prevent the Nationalists from policing their own territorial waters—including those off Formosa as well as the waters off the mainland itself (which the Nationalists still consider "their" waters)?

Pointed as these questions are, they do not include the biggest question of all.

I want to call this to the attention of the Senator from California, especially, because he has been more intelligently and consistently interested in the situation in the Far East, I believe, than any other of the 96 Senators and that is no reflection on other Senators:

Pointed as these questions are, they do not include the biggest question of all: Does the United States Government really think that it can protect and secure this island without protecting the government of this island? Does even the State Department persist in the illusion that it can ignore and destroy the government which rules this island without losing a position now acknowledged to be of vital interest to the United States?

I am going to reread the last sentence:

Does even the State Department persist in the illusion that it can ignore and destroy the government which rules this island without losing a position now acknowledged to be of vital interest to the United States?

MISSION FROM MAC

So far there has been one ray of good sense in United States-Formosa relationships. It comes from General MacArthur. The Nationalist mission in Tokyo has been assured that MacArthur will send a military mission here to inspect and consult as soon as he can.

Otherwise, in all matters affecting United States military contact and security on this island, I see nothing but an indictment of those in Washington who have perpetrated this crime against the vital interests of our country. This feeling has not been stimulated or fostered by the Nationalist officials I have seen here; it stems entirely from what any child can observe in Taipei today.

I am going to reread just one sentence:

I see nothing but an indictment of those in Washington who have perpetrated this crime against the vital interests of our country.

Mr. President, I believe I have overlooked something which I planned to read into the RECORD, but I have taken much more time than I had expected to take. Therefore, I ask to insert in the RECORD a total of 11 pages entitled "United States Civil Service Commission—Investigations Position—Report of Investigation." The document contains the further heading: "Economist, Department of State—Investigation Conducted by Federal Bureau of Investigation—Distribution: Department of State, Three Copies."

The document bears a stamp showing that it was received by the United States Civil Service Commission on, I believe, September 10, and that it was transmitted to the State Department. I ask that all these insertions be made in the body of the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—
INVESTIGATIONS POSITION—REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

(—, Economist, Department of State—Investigation Conducted by Federal Bureau of Investigation—Distribution: Department of State, Three copies—Report of FBI Special Agent Thomas A. Conroy, Washington, D. C., July 6, 1948)

—emigrated to United States August 8, 1935; naturalized at Washington, D. C., —. Place of birth, Moscow, Russia.

—indicated he attended Herder Real Gymnasium in Berlin and received LLB degree in 1933 from University of Berlin, MA degree in 1935 from Sorbonne, Paris, and l'Ecole des Sciences, Paris.

In 1936 he acted as interpreter at World Power Conference at Washington, D. C. From January to September — employed as market analyst for — Co., Stamford, Conn.; October — to June —, employed by Department of Justice as legal research assistant; stationed at —, doing research work on the —, during which time he wrote several chapters for —. Came to Washington, D. C., in January — as research assistant at — from —. On October —, appointed as assistant statistician, Statistical and Reference Division, Federal

Public Housing, Washington, D. C. On — made — research analyst; February — Transferred to —, remaining until entered — to September 18, 1945. — detailed to OSS. (While previously at —, was economic analyst, OSS—USSR Division.) Upon discharge, appointed — as economist, Division of Foreign and Economic Development, Department of State; — transferred to position of international economist, Division of Investment and Economic Development, Central and Eastern European Branch, where currently employed. In this capacity he works with the Assistant Chief and other ranking officers in the drafting of final policy determinations regarding various forms of economic assistance, investment, and development programs. He also makes policy recommendations in connection with questions of public and private investment and effect on industrial organization, economic stability and development of the central and eastern European areas and their relationship to the broad objective of the United States "foreign policy." For the past several months he has been working on the question of exports to Russia and the satellite nations. Currently residing at —, Washington, D. C.

BASIS FOR INVESTIGATION

An FBI informant of known reliability was contacted by the FBI during course of a previous security investigation conducted in June 1942. At this time he furnished a list containing names of persons of active indexes or mailing list of United American Spanish Aid Committee. List contained name —. (Group cited by Attorney General.)

Previous FBI investigations indicate that United American Spanish Aid Committee was organized by Communist Party and completely controlled by it.

An FBI agent who joined the Communist Party at the request of the Bureau in 1937 and was expelled from the Communist Party in 1948 and whose record as an informant was one of complete reliability, stated that — was a member of the Communist Party and personally know to him as such.

The same informant advised that — wife, —, had been a member of the Communist Party both before and after her marriage to —. She formerly lived with — and the wife of Bernard Addes. They have maintained close association with —, an admitted Communist Party member.

According to this informant — claimed to have been in the Communist Party in Europe and said his father had been a Trotskyite. — came to a lot of "open unit" meetings and to all recruiting meetings of the Communist Party from 1938 to sometime in 1942. This informant said he had had no contact with — since 1942, stating further that — was horrified at the Russo-German alliance in 1939.

Another reliable FBI informant recalled — as a member of the Communist Party in the late 1930s.

His wife, —, was formerly secretary to — of Workers Alliance. His wife, —, was member of and active in Young Communist League before and a while after she became a Communist Party member.

A reliable informant said Bernard Addes and his wife were associates of — in the late 1930's and these people were both members of the Communist Party and have been over a long period. Mrs. Addes and Mrs. — were long-time friends. Mr. Addes ran for governor of Maryland about 1934 on Communist Party ticket. Recently named in paper and by radio commentators as well-known Communists who contributed \$5,000 to the Presidential campaign fund of Wallace (verified through campaign records in office of Clerk of Senate—contributed February 8, 1943). The same informant said

that when Mrs. — was secretary to — she was a Communist Party member and it was strongly believed that — was also a member but his membership was never definitely established by informant. — however was a Communist sympathizer and propagated Communist principles and became quite friendly and associated with — through Mrs. —.

A confidential and reliable informant said — was closely associated with —, —, and —, who are admitted Communist Party members.

Mrs. — was found to have roomed with — who was considered by the Bureau, as the result of previous investigations, as a member of the Communist Party, and who also openly admits Communist Party membership.

—, —, Interstate Commerce Committee said he hired — to work with him on Brookings report in summer of 1933 because of his ability to read and speak French; specifically questioned — as to any Communist connections he might have had in Russia or Europe, and — said he had none, and expressed himself against Communist Party principles.

—, —, Federal Public Housing, states he has known — from 1938 to 1941, and had worked under him for 1 year. — highly regarded — and stated during the time he had known — had exhibited nothing reflecting on his loyalty.

— Division of Investment and Economic Development, European Division, Department of State, said he has known — since 1945 and is now his —. — has worked on some very difficult assignment involving Russia and the satellite countries and has never given any indication of disloyal tendencies. — stated that in his opinion, there was no question as to his loyalty.

—, Eastern European Division, Department of State, advised he has worked closely with — for the past 2 years.

— stated he has found him to possess views of a theoretical economist who frequently pushes ideas contrary to those held by persons concerned with political aspects of the question involved, but in every case he was sincere in his beliefs and in no way endeavored to bring about actions detrimental to the policy of the State Department. As this policy has become more and more clear, — has tended to go along with the political viewpoint of the State Department. — concluded by saying that in his opinion there was no question as to — loyalty.

— of the Eastern European Division, Department of State, advised he had had no contact during the past year but both were on a Committee on Czechoslovakia in 1946 in which two groups were involved, first theoretical economists who wanted to pour funds into Czechoslovakia and the group made up of those on the political desk who were inclined to be more cautious until a definite policy had been formulated by the State Department. — was on the former group and was often overzealous, endeavoring to dominate the committee in his capacity as executive secretary. — was made to realize the State Department's position and has caused no trouble since. — concluded by stating that he had no serious doubts as to — loyalty.

— Office of United Nations Affairs, said — had been — of the above committee on Czechoslovakia as well as other committees. — advised that never before had — seen a member of the committee adopt an attitude such as that exemplified by —. She said that — evidenced a strong pro-Czechoslovakian attitude and approached every question with the query: "How will this affect Czechoslovakia?" and not "How will it affect the overall policy of the United States." — said

— immediate reaction was that he must be a Czechian National or at least of Czechoslovakian ancestry. — had no contact other than the 3 months' period from April to July 1946 and said — could not comment other than to state from his actions — would hesitate to place too much trust in him from a loyalty standpoint.

The following is a signed statement dated September 7, 1948, from —, as follows:

I served as — of the Czechoslovakian committee in May and June of 1946. My acquaintance with the person in whom you are interested is limited to this period. At the first meeting and at all meetings thereafter, I noted that he approached each problem from the standpoint "How will this help Czechoslovakia?" As I recall, such questions as German transit rates, the settlement of the army's debts, and further loans to Czechoslovakia were under consideration. I know nothing about the person in question, but the bias displayed was so marked that I queried the — and found she had reacted in similar fashion. I assumed he was of Czech origin and checked the register as a matter of curiosity, only to discover that his origin was Russian. Since he had worked in other agencies and his origin would naturally have caused him to be thoroughly investigated, I did nothing further at the time.

I recall two other episodes. He requested me to have reproduced, as a committee document, an article by Maurice Hindus which had appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (I believe at the request of Congressman SABATH, but am not certain). The article was a eulogy of Benes' policy of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. Apart from the contents of the article (about which I had grave questions), the request to publish it as a committee document was peculiarly out of order. I spoke with Mr. Gange and Mr. Reber of the secretariat about it, but they took the position that the secretariat couldn't question a committee member's request. I then spoke with Mr. Williamson, the committee chairman, stressing the inappropriateness and the expense (the article was lengthy). He directed me not to issue it as a document, but to obtain a few copies of the RECORD and circulate them for information. That was done.

At that stage I was beginning to have doubts of the nature of the pro-Czech bias—was it pro-Czech or pro-Soviet, particularly since the reports from our Embassy were to the effect that Czechoslovakia was over the hump and that he might be building up Czech industry for Russia. All the information coming into the Department during that period was certainly opposed to the position taken by the person under consideration, and policy in line with the reports was established by the Secretary shortly thereafter. Toward the end of June I attended a meeting of the Russian committee under Mr. —, secretary of the committee, at which the individual under consideration was present. After the meeting, which was on a highly secret matter, — commented that he considered the individual dangerously pro-Soviet and that he intended to discuss the question of his further attendance with the chairman of the Russian committee. I do not know what subsequently transpired, since I went on detail to UIVA early in July.

To summarize: I was so strongly convinced initially of pro-Czech bias that I assumed the individual was of Czech origin, but the matters involved were such that Soviet interests were also served. The weight of opinion and information from the Embassy during the period did not affect his judgment or approach, although it directly preceded and must have entered into the sharp policy decision by the Secretary. I believe I was totally unaffected by the Russian origin of the

individual since that fact plus his previous employment led me to assume that he would have undergone a searching investigation and must have been cleared. It was considerably later, when all connection with the committee and the individual had been terminated, that I recommended an investigation.

The determining factor was the realization, from facts emerging in other cases, that the assumption of thorough investigation in view of background was not necessarily valid. I still hesitated since I am totally opposed to Red smearing and other forms of harassment. I was questioned about another individual both by the Department security officers and by FBI agents and was impressed by their ability and by their sincerity in trying to search out the truth. With that assurance of a thorough investigation and fair hearing for the individual, I felt that I dared not refrain any longer from recommending an investigation. This is the only instance in over 6 years in the Department when I have felt that I had to take such action.

—, Eastern European Division, Department of State, said he had been working very closely with — recently on the question of trade relations with Russia and the satellite nations as to the policy this country should take regarding exports to those countries. It has been his observation that — has constantly advocated a "be soft policy" toward Russia and her satellite nations. — said this would be consistent with the Communist Party lines; however, there has been nothing to indicate the latter to be so. — volunteered that he could not see how anyone in touch with the situation could adopt such an attitude as the employee and because of his Russian ancestry he would be inclined to be very alert as to the question of — loyalty.

—, of the Department of State, said he has known — for some time, but only from contact in committee meetings. He had had no contact in recent months. — stated that from what he had observed he might question — judgment but never his loyalty.

—, a former resident manager of — Avenue NW., advised that — had lived there about 10 years ago; and that he recalled that at this time there was some literature distributed in the building advocating some kind of "peace group." — stated that he recalled clearly that some one of the other tenants had advised him that this literature had been distributed by —.

Washington confidential informant of known reliability, readily recalled both — and his wife, —, as having lived at — NW., prior to moving to —. Prior to this the same informant recalled that — and — lived at —. When the — had been recently married they moved to —, and the above informant definitely recalled — as having received Communist literature at — NW., and that he recalled that both of the — received similar Communist literature at —, relating to some "youth group."

Washington confidential informant of known reliability advised that the name of — appeared on the active indices of the American Peace Mobilization.

—, of the Federal Housing Office, Greenbelt, Md., advised that the — had come there to live on —, and stayed until —. — recalled — had some trouble with the — regarding one — and — residing with him in violation of the rental regulations which prevented residents from sharing or subrenting their apartments. She said the three were very close friends.

A reliable confidential informant advised that — had changed his name to —

and was a former member of the Young Communist League and is presently believed to be a member of the Communist Party. — father has been a Communist Party member over a period of time.

Washington confidential informant advised that Mr. and Mrs. —, Washington, D. C., appeared on a membership list of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; this organization has merged with several others and is now known as the Civil Rights Congress. Both of these organizations have been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States. Washington confidential informant who gave the above information is of established reliability and furnished the information to the Federal Bureau of Investigation during a previous investigation in March 1941.

— was a fellow employee of — when they were employed by the United States Housing Authority in Washington. At another Government agency, — listed — as a reference, describing — as being well acquainted with him and could furnish information as to — loyalty and character. — was a member of the Washington Bookshop Association; Louisville (Ky.) chapter of the American Youth Congress; and listed on the active indices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. All organizations are listed on the subversive list of the Attorney General of the United States. It has also been reliably reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigation that — was discharged from a position as announcer for a Louisville, Ky., radio station in 1937 for making strong pro-Communist statements over the air in violation of that station's censorship regulations.

The State Department Passport Division files show that — was issued a passport on —, for travel to France, England, and Switzerland for a vacation; the file contains the name of —, a State Department employee, — Avenue NW. — signed an affidavit for the passport application that she had known — for 3 years. Washington confidential informant, considered reliable, reported that — was a member of the Washington Bookshop Association and the United American Spanish Aid Committee during a previous FBI investigation in March 1942. Washington confidential informant also advised that — was a member of the Communist Party and that she and — both held Communist Party meetings in their respective apartments at — New Hampshire Avenue NW. They were both very friendly with the —.

FBI REPORT, JUNE 28, 1948, RICHMOND, VA.; SPECIAL AGENT CLAUDE E. WILLIS, JR.

—, confidential informant who is believed reliable, furnished signed statement June 24, 1948, and advised that she is willing to testify before Loyalty Board provided her identity is not revealed to the employee.

"As I remember Mr. — when he lived in the — Apartment, — New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., in about 1939 and 1940, I would consider his actions to indicate that he was disloyal to the United States Government. Though about 8 years have elapsed since my contact with Mr. —, and my conception of the term 'Communist' and 'fellow traveler' may have been colored by present meanings of these terms, I feel that Mr. — perhaps was and may be a Communist or fellow traveler. By 'Communist' I mean 'A group or groups to overthrow our Government or cause dissension or dissatisfaction with our way of government or anyone who is loyal to the Russian Government.' By 'fellow traveler' I mean 'A cover-up group for the Communists who do their dirty work.' By 'dirty work' I mean 'To pass out their literature or make contacts for them.'

"During the time I saw Mr. — I observed him passing out literature in the lobby of the apartment for the — Group, which at that time I considered to be a group which were disloyal to the United States. I received one copy of these pamphlets. I cannot recall that it said anything of a disloyal nature, however. I also recall that Mr. — put this literature under the doors of the apartments on the upper floors. I believe Mr. — was a member of the — Organization, because he tried to sell the principals of the organization to two of the elevator operators which he intimated to the operators as being better than our American way. He frequently talked about their low pay and long working hours. He seemed to me to be a fanatic on anything pertaining to labor, to unions, to conditions under which Americans work, and the pay scales. This to me was an indication that Mr. — might be a Communist.

"Another reason which makes me think that he might be a Communist is that he gave out literature which I heard supported the Spanish Loyalists, which group I recall was supported by the Communists of Russia at that time. I know that Mr. — was receiving mail from Spain because * * *

Witness: Claude E. Willis.

FBI REPORT, JUNE 24, 1948, CHICAGO, ILL.; SPECIAL AGENT DANIEL J. MCCARTHY

Mr. —, professor of economics, — University, Evanston, Ill., — State Department's Division of Investment and Economic Development, and was —. He recalled that a whispering campaign about — loyalty had been rife for a while in his division. He believed that the only basis for it was that — was foreign born. Mr. — expressed the opinion that — was loyal.

FBI REPORT, JUNE 28, 1948; SPECIAL AGENT JOSEPH M. KELLY

—, professor of economics, Russian Institute, — University advised that from — to January — he was — Economics Subdivision, U. S. S. R. Division, OSS, and that — was on his staff for a year. Mr. — stated he became fairly well acquainted with — and that he had heard or seen nothing to indicate disloyalty. Mr. — concluded on the basis of his knowledge of — that he is loyal.

—, executive of — Co., advised that in —, he was a deputy on the financial matters to William Clayton and — Division of Financial and Development Policy. — advised that — was employed in — under one —, chief of a section under —. Mr. — stated that his contacts with — were very limited. In 1946 a — joined the State Department and worked under —, and that — was probably one of — staff officers at present. — always spoke favorably of — and because of this Mr. — stated he was of the opinion — was loyal.

FBI REPORT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., SPECIAL AGENT RICHARD T. CLANCEY

—, — University, —, said he was — of the Committee on Russian Economic Affairs in the State Department in — and that — represented the Czechoslovakian section of the State Department in the committee meetings. It became apparent to some of the committee after a meeting or two that — seemed to be more patriotic to his own country of birth than to the United States. Dr. — advised, further that — approach to the problems under consideration appeared "colored" and that — did not have the traditional American patriotism it

was felt was needed for persons serving on this committee. He said he could not say that — was disloyal to the United States but he did not feel he was 100 percent American. Dr. — was reluctant to go into further detail. He advised that the committee decided to make it a closed membership, which action was a courteous way of dispensing with the services of the employee.

FBI REPORT, NEW HAVEN, CONN., JUNE 28, 1948; SPECIAL AGENT HUGO P. BLANDORI

— Manufacturing Co., Stamford, Conn. The personnel folder showed that — as employed by that firm from — to — as clerk. Previous employment shown as engaged in law work with — for 1 year. Subsequently he worked in advertising with the — Corp. from which he resigned when he left for —.

FBI report, Miami, Fla., dated June 12, 1948, stated unable to locate any record or knowledge of — at Stetson University 1937-38 as stated by employee.

FBI REPORT, NEW YORK CITY, JUNE 11, 1948; SPECIAL AGENT JOSEPH M. KELLY

—, vice president of the — Co., said he first met — in 1937 or 1938 when — immigrated to the United States from Europe. Mr. —'s father-in-law was friendly with —'s grandfather when both resided in Moscow.

—'s family had been very wealthy but lost all property to the Soviets after the 1917 revolution and were forced to leave Russia as refugees. To the best of his knowledge — received most of his education in France, and when — came to the United States he visited the — home in New York City for a while. Mr. — has not seen — for 4 or 5 years. He recalled that — several times mentioned his admiration for the United States. On the basis of his limited acquaintance with — Mr. — considers — to be loyal to the United States.

FBI REPORT, DETROIT, MICH., JUNE 23, 1948; SPECIAL AGENT JAMES J. KEARNEY

—, — of the — former — Division of Foreign Economic Development, Department of State, advised he had only a slight contact with — in the office. From observing — at work and listening to comments, — states he is of the opinion — is a loyal American.

FBI REPORT, ST. PAUL, MINN. JULY 7, 1948; SPECIAL AGENT ARTHUR J. NORSTROM

— advised that although — worked under his supervision at the Federal Public Housing Authority from — to — as an economist, he knew little concerning — activities and absolutely nothing that would reflect on —'s loyalty. —, coworker in the Division of Investment and Economic Development, European Division, Department of State, advised he had worked side by side with — for the past 2 years and stated, in his opinion there is not a more loyal person in the Department of State. However, — advised that he also knows — socially as a friend and knows him to be an acquaintance of —.

During FBI investigation 1941, — was a member of the National Lawyers Guild; closely associated with — and — was thoroughly aware of —'s Communist activities. — is known as a — member under the name — and has been engaged in Russian espionage over a long period of time and at one time was active in recruiting espionage agents from the ranks of the Communist Party.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent of July 19, 1950]

THEY ACT LIKE SCREHEADS

The fact that Senator McCARTHY's blasting of the State Department is recognized the country over as the major cause of the reversal of our idiotic Asian policy does not set very well with the Capital Times or the Milwaukee Journal which sometimes team up as they did in using the story of a reporter who deliberately aimed to deceive the public by omitting important written details from filed papers.

The Times and Journal are fuming and furious, and may even have a hemorrhage, because it appears from the income tax statements of the Senator that he borrowed a substantial amount of money.

Of course those connected with the Times and Journal say nothing about the fact that they, and the institutions with which they are concerned, have borrowed money in excess of the amount that Senator McCARTHY probably borrowed. When they did the borrowing and took the chances, they looked upon the transactions as strictly in the American tradition, as they certainly were, but when Senator McCARTHY did exactly the same thing, or something similar, they began tearing their hair out in gobs.

What is a virtue in them becomes an offense in Senator McCARTHY. What is a privilege to them is nothing short of presumption upon the part of this commoner who dares to try to better his condition in the world.

Apparently the Senator decided that he might better sell his property, liquidate his loans, and devote the small equity he received to running down the Lattimore-Acheson-Roth-Service-Remington gang at Washington, a procedure that threw the Times and the Journal into crusty and grouchy moods.

Senator McCARTHY is devoting his time and his talents to rooting out the dizzy apes and slug-nuts who have been leading America to ruin with the softly panting approval of the haughty and egocentric professional liberals who have been in fact, the world over, the softest snap the Kremlin ever ran into.

The average man on the street is no fool and, given the honest facts, he can make up his mind pretty well without the aid of any big-lipped scatterbrains. That ordinary man knows that it took a sledgehammer to batter down the defenses erected by mumbler and bumbler of the Lattimore-Acheson order, and that if Senator McCARTHY had not done just exactly what he did do, all Korea and Formosa would now be in the hands of Moscow and we would be picking up our duds in Japan and the Philippines and moving home. It took some strong language upon the part of a man in the Senate to reverse the whole lunatic and defeatist attitude of the State Department and the fact that an innocent toe here and there may have been stepped upon is of trivial importance.

May we not suggest to these newspapers with the bloodshot eyes that they investigate the Senator's socks and seek if they are purple. Anyway, they won't be red or pink.

EXHIBIT 2

AS WE SEE IT—SENATE REPUDIATES BUDENZ' TESTIMONY

(By Rob F. Hall)

WASHINGTON.—While the eyes of the Nation were on Korea, trying to gage whether this aggression of the Truman administration was likely to become a world war, something very unusual but not unwelcome occurred last week in the Senate. The sworn

testimony of a professional stool pigeon was discredited, rejected, and repudiated by the formal actions of a Senate subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of the Senate as a whole.

Interest grows, of course, when one realizes that the professional stool pigeon was Louis Francis Budenz, whose eager lies have been so helpful to the Justice Department in its drive against Communists and progressives.

Prosecutor McGohey relied heavily on the tortuous fabrications of Budenz in his case against the 11 Communist leaders. Judge Medina took pains that the jury should give it great weight. In the opinion of newsmen covering the trial, the testimony of Budenz was the lever by which the prosecution pried a guilty verdict from the jury.

It was the more or less unsupported word of Budenz which brought a jail sentence for Harold Christoffel, the Milwaukee labor leader. And during the last couple of years, few noncitizens have been ordered deported for their political views without the gloat-ing participation of Louis Francis Budenz.

Since the freedom and happiness of so many individuals and the life of certain democratic institutions depend so heavily on the word of this creature, his credibility is a matter of more than passing concern to the Nation. It is therefore of the greatest significance that the Senate of the United States did not regard him as credible or trustworthy.

Budenz testified April 20 before an open session and on April 25 before a closed session of the Tydings subcommittee. At the open session, with the klieg lights and the cameras spotlighting his garrulous exhibition, Budenz said Prof. Owen Lattimore was known to him as a Communist. At the closed session he said something similar about Haldore Hansen, a writer on Chinese affairs holding a minor post with the State Department.

The Tydings subcommittee, assigned to investigate Senator Joe McCARTHY's charges that scores of Communists held jobs in the State Department, listened respectfully to Budenz. But after they heard his testimony and compared it with a wealth of material at their disposal, including copious FBI reports on McCARTHY's victims, they could not escape the conclusion that Louis Francis was a sordid liar.

The subcommittee cleared Hansen and Lattimore. In their report accepted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate, members said Budenz' testimony left them "to a degree, in wonderment."

"We cannot accept Mr. Budenz' hearsay testimony as controlling," the report said in reference to the Hansen case. (Budenz' testimony at Foley Square was not only hearsay; it was mainly his opinions.)

His testimony concerning Professor Lattimore "was not altogether satisfying," the report said.

The Tydings subcommittee was especially struck by the fact that "even though Budenz has been reporting for several years to the FBI on various Communist activities and personalities," it was only after the McCARTHY circus hit town that Budenz climbed aboard that particular bandwagon. "Only since this investigation and the publicity concerning Lattimore therewith has Budenz given information to the FBI concerning Lattimore," the report commented.

This sudden rush of old memories to Budenz as a result of which he came up with the recollection that Lattimore and Hansen were "Communists" was "necessarily puzzling" to the subcommittee.

Beware of Budenz' yeoman service to the Fascist drive against progressives, the subcommittee was anxious that their repudiation of his yarns should not destroy for all

time the usefulness of the Justice Department's stool pigeon. They therefore wrote into the report a sort of escape clause for Louis Francis' "character."

"We recognize that Budenz has been used as a witness by the Government in other cases where his testimony was not hearsay and was corroborated. Here of course his testimony is hearsay and corroboration is lacking. This observation is necessarily not a reflection upon Mr. Budenz' veracity inasmuch as his testimony related to what he was told by Communists."

But this is poor consolation to Louis Francis and his Justice Department sponsors. The Senators have chosen not to believe him on oath. They have, moreover, suggested that his thirst for the limelight seduced him into making sensational statements which they, for partisan reasons, felt compelled to expose as lies. The crumb they tossed him could not conceal their contempt for the professional liar.

The chairman of the subcommittee, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, basing himself on the official document, called Senator McCARTHY a perjurer, a "fraud and a hoax." Inferentially, Louis Budenz was also condemned as an accomplice to perjury and fraud.

Meanwhile the perjury and fraud committed by Budenz in the trials of Communists and progressives go unpunished. This sleek little pigeon slips furtively from stool to stool while his victims, truly good men and women, face deportation and prison.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent of July 22, 1950]

SO HERE IS HOW IT STANDS

The three Democrats on the Senate committee investigating the McCarthy charges have found them to be wholly without foundation.

The two Republicans differed violently with this conclusion. They characterize the investigation as "superficial and inconclusive, the atmosphere too often not that of seeking to ascertain the truth whereas the committee's record is a tangle of loose threads, of witnesses not subpoenaed, of leads not followed up."

The people who want to arrive at the correct conclusion in a matter of this importance must thread their way through a maze of closed doors, suddenly secret sessions, and a battery of obvious defamers who tried their level best to prevent the committee from investigating the charges by preferring charges against the Senator himself.

But even the Democrats upon the committee are forced reluctantly to conclude that some of those attacked by Senator McCARTHY were, to quote these Democrats, "naive and gullible" and that others were guilty of conduct described as "extremely indiscreet."

So a man who admittedly gives to a Red top-secret information and whose voice is recorded by the FBI as he tells that Red that it is a secret, is slapped upon the wrist and told that he was extremely indiscreet, while he is returned to his position where he may commit further indiscretions.

In attempting to get order out of confusion let us look at some of the presented evidence.

On June 21, Senator TYDINGS asserted "that a special inquiry by the Federal Bureau of Investigation had established as false Mr. McCARTHY's accusations that the files had been stripped or raped before being turned over to the subcommittee."

A short time thereafter Senator McCARTHY sent out a photostat of a letter written to him by the head of the FBI as follows:

"I have received your letter dated June 27, 1950, inquiring whether this Bureau has examined the 61 loyalty files which the mem-

bers of the Tydings committee have been scrutinizing and whether such an examination by the FBI has disclosed that the files are complete and that nothing has been removed therefrom. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has made no such examination and therefore is not in a position to make any statement concerning the completeness or incompleteness of the State Department files."

So much for that Tydings whopper.

Continue along the same road because the scenery is quite interesting.

Unable to get the Tydings committee to subpoena further witnesses who would testify that they were directed to strip the records, Senator McCARTHY sent to the President the affidavits of four such witnesses, and supplied the press of the country with photostatic copies of such affidavits. Three of such witnesses gave their names. One was a junior at Georgetown University, another was an FBI agent, a third was employed in private industry, and the fourth still works for the State Department and said that he would supply his name only if the President would assure him that he would not be fired for telling the truth. No such assurance ever came from the White House.

Let us see what these four witnesses said in their affidavits. Quoting from the one who is still employed by the State Department will be sufficient because the statements were much the same. He swore:

"In August 1946, I started working as a clerk in the State Department * * * I was assigned to a project with other clerks on the State Department personnel files. We all were instructed to remove all derogatory material from the personnel files and we were instructed to dispose of these materials. The derogatory material consisted of letters, memorandum which reflected on the employee. I cannot remember any specific file because we all worked on many files. But we worked on this project from August until the end of December 1946. All of the derogatory material in the files was destroyed or thrown away."

It is more than passing strange that a committee appointed to investigate charges refused to even listen to the evidence of four witnesses, one of them still working for the State Department, and refused stubbornly to let the people of this country have their evidence.

The people will draw their own conclusions. From Senator McCARTHY they have received all the evidence he could gather. This evidence showed that men were employed to destroy evidence. It also showed that the Tydings committee willfully falsified to the country by pretending that the FBI had gone through records which the FBI deliberately says it never went through.

Moreover, the Tydings committee acted as though it always had something to hide. When it had a piece of evidence that seemed to refute the McCarthy charges, it brought it out in public with a brass band. When it was time to inquire why men high in the State Department gave secret documents by the hundreds to fellows like Jaffe, the committee locked the doors and drew the curtains.

We expect that the public conclusions on this case will not be far out of the way.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 19, 1950]

THE REPORT NOBODY BELIEVES

TYDINGS and Co. says there are no Communists in the State Department and there is no Communist influence in the State Department. These findings would be welcome, if true. Unfortunately nobody believes them.

We can say with little fear of contradiction that even the three New Deal Senators who

offer the country this sugared assurance don't believe their own statement.

What we had in the congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster we are now given again—a large bucket of white-wash. What we had when incredible mismanagement was charged to the atomic-energy committee is tossed back at us again—denials and evasions. But, meanwhile, four spies in this country and one in England who were stealing our atomic secrets for Russia have been arrested.

What Mr. Truman called the Alger Hiss case—a "red herring"—has been served up to us by the administration once more. The herring is a little higher now, and Hiss, convicted as a perjury spy, is under sentence of 5 years and has been disbarred.

We have got precisely what we have come to expect from every political investigation by the New Deal—self-exculpation by the party which has fostered, condoned, and protected betrayals of the national interest and public trust such as this country has never before known.

What else could we expect? This is the party of lies. It is the party of Roosevelt, telling America's fathers and mothers "again and again and again" that, on no account, would their sons be sent into a war he was then plotting.

It is the party of Truman, the product of the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, where, when 71 henchmen faced the penitentiary for stealing the primary election in 1946, the simple solution presenting itself was to blow the courthouse safe and steal the fraudulent ballots providing the evidence.

Truman is the man who only 2 years ago said of Stalin, "I like old Joe, Joe is a decent fellow." If the Loss Communist is a decent fellow, then who is to say that lesser, non-Russian Communists are also not decent fellows?

Certainly the New Deal Senators who were commissioned to investigate Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY's charges of Communist infiltration of the administration found nobody who did not measure up to their standards for being a decent fellow. But why not? Look at the Senators:

MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, New Dealer, was the original sponsor of the present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, when the latter was presented as nominee for under-secretary of the Treasury in 1933. TYDINGS conceded at the time that he had initiated the move to put Acheson in the job. To statements that Acheson's law firm had extensive Wall Street connections, TYDINGS replied that Acheson had also represented Russia in American courts and accepted Moscow's fees. Now, as Secretary of State, Acheson presides over Truman's world-wide anti-Communist crusade.

TYDINGS also happens to be the son-in-law of Joseph E. Davies, Roosevelt's Russophile ambassador to Russia, whose book *Mission to Moscow*, was a flagrant piece of pro-Soviet propaganda. By another curious coincidence, Seth Richardson, chairman of the President's loyalty review board, through which there filtered all of the curious characters Senator McCARTHY has called security risks, is a law partner of Davies. And TYDINGS was appointed chairman by the New Dealers to investigate the whole mess.

THEODORE F. GREEN, New Deal Senator from Rhode Island, is 83 years old and is chiefly distinguished as the one-time little Hitler of the tiny New England State. In January 2, 1935, even before being sworn in for his second term as governor, GREEN, in the space of less than two hours, engineered a coup unique in the history of American government.

He ousted the five Republicans composing the existing State supreme court and replaced them with a Democratic majority.

He killed 80 State boards and commissions manned by Republicans. He restored to himself powers long since taken from the governorship.

All of this Senator GREEN accomplished by unseating elected Republican State senators on the basis of a quick recount by two of his henchmen, thus converting a Democratic Senate minority into a majority.

GREEN's lieutenant governor, Robert E. Quinn, his chief agent in this bloodless revolution, succeeded GREEN when the latter became a Senator. Quinn is chiefly remembered for using the State militia to shut down the Narragansett race track in order to put a political enemy out of business.

The third New Dealer on the TYDINGS whitewash majority is BRIEN McMAHON, an old hand at sweeping New Deal dirt under the rug.

McMAHON for years was one of the officials of the New Deal Department of Justice, the agency charged with exposing and prosecuting subversives. If the justice of Senator McCARTHY's assertion that the State Department was loaded with protected Communists and fellow travelers were admitted, McMAHON would have been in the position of exposing the culpability of the Department he so long served, and furthermore, his own dereliction as chief of its criminal division.

As chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. McMAHON previously had bent all of his efforts toward proving that the Atomic Energy Commission had properly safeguarded the secrets of the atom bomb. Only later did the arrest of members of the Soviet atomic spy ring demonstrate the spuriousness of the whitewash applied to the charges of Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER that the atomic secret had not been guarded.

These three—TYDINGS, GREEN and McMAHON—abruptly voted to stop the McCARTHY investigation when the war in Korea afforded a convenient diversion. They hurried to completion the report now announced, clearing every single suspect. They did not permit their two Republican committee colleagues, Senators HICKENLOOPER and HENRY CAROT LODGE, to inspect their report.

They departed from the rules of the Senate by releasing the report to the press before they even tendered it to the full Senate Foreign Relation Committee, in whose name they acted as a subcommittee. Senator CONNALLY, the New Deal chairman of that committee, limped forward with a summons for the committee to meet and receive the report 24 hours after it had been published in the Nation's press.

LODGE and HICKENLOOPER would have none of TYDINGS' phony clearance. Internationalist and supporter of the administration's foreign policy though he is, LODGE found the whole proceeding too much for a sensitive stomach. In a separate statement, he asserted:

"The investigation must be set down as superficial and inconclusive. The proceedings often lacked impartiality; the atmosphere was too often not that of seeking to ascertain the truth. The subcommittee's record is a tangle of loose threads, of witnesses who were not subpoenaed, of leads which were not followed up . . . this business will never end, clearly or otherwise, if the practice of having the majority party investigate the majority continues to hold sway."

The pretext of the Tydings New Dealers for giving clearance to all of the men and women whom Senator McCARTHY had dubbed Stalin's little helpers was that the State Department loyalty files which the subcommittee, after months of Presidential obstruction, was finally permitted to inspect showed "nothing derogatory."

Senator McCARTHY had anticipated this weak defense. He had produced, in advance

of the release of the Tydings report, statements from one present and three former employees of the State Department that in 1946 the administration had a team of eight persons working for 5 months to weed everything from the files which was derogatory or incriminating.

A deadline was set for this task: It had to be completed before the democratic congressional majority was replaced by a Republican majority elected to the Eightieth Congress. State Department officials were even permitted to strip their personal files, so that the men who were defendants were able to destroy the evidence against themselves.

So, all provision having been made, and a rigged investigation undertaken for the purpose of ratifying a predetermined judgment, the Nation is now told by the New Deal that Prof. Owen Lattimore, the New Deal pilot of America's policy in the Orient, was never of service to Russia. The public is informed that Dr. Philip Jessup, ambassador-at-large, who was knee deep in Communists in all of his years with the Institute of Pacific Relations, is neither a knave nor a dupe, as Mr. McCARTHY called him.

The people are told that John Stewart Service, State Department far eastern expert, cleared no less than six times by the New Deal Loyalty Boards (would a man whose loyalty was unquestioned have to make as many farewell appearances as Sarah Bernhardt?) may have been indiscreet in his dealings with Communists, but that is all.

And the Nation is also told that there was no fix in the case of the six persons arrested for wartime espionage in the theft of 1,700 secret Government documents which found their way to the offices of the pro-Soviet magazine *Amerasia*.

In fact, by assurance of TYDINGS and his New Deal friends, the people need not feel disturbed about anything, and least of all about Communist manipulation of New Deal policy. The three Senators thus have made themselves a part of the Communist conspiracy at a time when it is obvious that our weakness in Korea was made known to the Communists of the Kremlin, and when it is certain that that weakness was promoted within the administration.

The American people now have a simple criterion for determining Communist influence in this country. It will be evidenced fully by counting up those who support the Tydings report.

[From the Shreveport Times of July 19, 1950]
GREEN LIGHTS FOR THE REDS

The thoroughly absurd report by the majority of the Tydings committee investigating Reds in the State Department is a green light to further and future activities of fellow travelers and their friends in undermining America and Americanism right inside our own Government. The report would be the biggest laugh of the century but for the fact that a lot of green kids, some of them teen-agers, are dying in Korea with their faces in the mud—and sometimes with their hands tied behind them. It was blindness of the type displayed by the Tydings group—inside the State Department and outside it—which laid the foundation for the international fumbling of the Truman administration that brought on the Korean situation. It is the Tydings group that now says that revelations of those subversives and blindness to them in the State Department and outside it are fraud and hoax. And as long as we have such as the Tydings group to clear the disloyalties, the traitors, the fifth columnists, and the nit-wits who don't know what they are doing, just so long will we have those subversives and Commies and lefties and disloyalists gnawing at the vitals of the Americanism

built and fostered through the decades and now facing destruction through those who should be its foremost supporters.

However, there is nothing surprising in this action of the Tydings majority of the investigating committee.

Hasn't it been clear from the beginning that the majority had just one objective—to clear everybody with a tinge from light pink to deep red and to smear Senator McCARTHY, who forced the inquiry?

Didn't President Truman call all such inquiries "red herrings"—particularly the earlier investigation into Alger Hiss, Roosevelt confidential adviser, which finally headed Hiss and others toward penitentiaries? Didn't President Truman personally say he would do everything possible to disprove the McCarthy charges—to clear the accused?

Didn't President Truman personally bar essential files and evidence from the committee?

Didn't the President and his subordinates open some files only after it was known that they had been looted of all important material?

Didn't the Washington administration try to put the hush-hush on the fact that some 200 perverts had been found in the State Department and finally fired?

And did agencies of this same Washington administration then rehire some of the perverts previously fired?

And isn't it a known fact that such perversion is the strongest and one of the most used forms of blackmail by enemy agents seeking secret information from within Government departments?

Didn't the Washington administration try to cover up the whole *Amerasia* case with an early Saturday morning court hearing in which United States attorneys acted virtually as defense counsel for those pleading guilty to possession of stolen secret State Department documents?

And wasn't the investigation that might have convicted others in the same case mysteriously hushed and blocked?

The questions could be carried on indefinitely. The answer to each and every one of them is, "Yes!"

As Senator McCARTHY said of the report:

"The most loyal stooges of the Kremlin could not have done a better job of giving a clean bill of health to Stalin's fifth column in this country."

Get out your medals, Mr. Stalin; there are some fellows in Washington who seem to deserve them.

Perhaps, also, attention of the "clear everybody" boys in Washington might be called to this Washington news dispatch, which came over the Associated Press wires along with the story of the Tydings clearance report and was published, with it, on page 1 of most newspapers:

"WASHINGTON, July 17.—The FBI Monday arrested a fourth American in connection with the leak of United States atom bomb secrets to the Russians.

"FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said that Julius Rosenberg, 32, operator of an engineering plant in New York City and a former member of the Army Signal Corps, had been taken into custody in New York on a charge of conspiracy to commit espionage.

"Hoover described Rosenberg as 'another important link in the Soviet espionage apparatus.'

"During the last 2 months the FBI took into custody Harry Gold, Philadelphia biochemist, Alfred Dean Slack, Syracuse, N. Y., scientist and David Greenglass, former United States Army sergeant, on similar charges. Greenglass is also from New York City.

"Each is charged with feeding top secrets on American defense to the Russians in wartime—a charge carrying the possible death penalty."

Yes, "each is charged with feeding top secrets on American defense to the Russians * * *

And where and how did they get those top defense secrets, theft of which may be directly or indirectly responsible in part for green kids dying in Korea? Why, through conditions exposed in the State Department and elsewhere by McCARTHY and others—revelation of which is termed by the Tydings report as "gigantic in its fraud and deep in its deceit."

A SHAMEFUL PERFORMANCE

The Tydings committee's majority report on the McCarthy charges of Communist influence in the State Department is probably the most disgracefully partisan document ever to emanate from the Congress of the United States.

As a public paper prepared in parlous times, it verges upon disloyalty.

As such, it goes beyond the obvious objective of whitewashing the New Deal's calamitous foreign policy.

The inquiry on which the report was based was a staged and superficial travesty of investigative procedure.

For the committee made no real investigation.

It clamped a New Deal Maxim silencer on the junior counsel representing the Republican minority.

It was friendly to the New Deal witnesses; it was palpably hostile to the McCarthy witnesses; and it permitted no proper cross-examinations.

The majority prepared its report without consulting the minority members.

And, as Senator LODGE has said, it totally ignored its actual mandate from the Senate, which was a broad directive covering the whole question of disloyalty.

The sordidly political nature of the Tydings-Green-McMahon report is self-evident.

It made Senator McCARTHY—rather than the offenders in the notorious Amerasia larcenies, and the pro-Communist policy makers in the State Department—the apparent culprit.

In a front-page dispatch from Washington the New York Times said of the three Democrats:

"They attacked Mr. McCARTHY, a Wisconsin Republican, in terms of harshness rarely used in the Senate's history.

"They accused him of conscious falsehood and of serving the interests of the Communists by raising baseless suspicions among the people of the country.

"They cleared every person who had been accused by Senator McCARTHY."

No wonder, as the Times also reported, the two Republican members declined to sign the report.

Neither is the New Deal's clearance of accused persons free from doubt and suspicion.

One of those accused was Owen Lattimore, who advocated our desertion of Nationalist China and our surrender of Korea to communism.

Respecting him, the New Deal report says: "Even the testimony of Louis F. Budenz, if given the fullest weight and import, could establish no more than that the Communists used Lattimore to project a propaganda line anent China."

But what else was the Tydings committee appointed to establish?

For the record shows that Lattimore—by implication at least a Communist tool—for years was an influential State Department adviser.

[From the Dallas Morning News of July 19, 1950]

WHITWASH, PITCH IN ODD MIXTURE

The Senate's Foreign Relations Subcommittee set up to investigate the charges made

by Senator McCARTHY has brought in a majority report that is certain to be confusing to the average citizen. There is no concurrence from the membership of the minority hostile party. Perusal of the full text shows clearly the reason for that. The minority could hardly lend their approval to the mixture of whitewash and pitch discernible in the welter of words that lead up to the six sensible recommendations which the committee makes in finality.

As to these, there can be little disagreement in principle, but Senator LODGE has a sounder nonpolitical proposal for the make-up of a nonpartisan group for an over-all investigation than the majority could stomach. There will be hearty accord with the view that there must be some brake on the power of Members of the two Houses to slander individuals under the cloak of congressional immunity, and there can be no logical objection to a demand for more orderly conduct of hearings, for greater information on the operations of the State Department, and for improved system in protecting the security of classified documents.

Unfortunately the subcommittee majority has operated in an atmosphere of partisan spleen on both sides. The majority notes bitterly that "it has been subject to an organized campaign of unwarranted and unfair vilification without parallel in the history of congressional investigations." If so, it has squared itself amply with Senator McCARTHY by handing him the lie direct. Indeed if the full Senate shares the subcommittee view, it would not be surprising to see a test made in impeachment proceedings. Few men have been as severely castigated by their colleagues in an official report.

Certainly the report does not answer all questions. On July 12, McCARTHY filed with the President a complaint supported by photostats that the majority is also guilty of misstatements. A letter from J. Edgar Hoover asserts that the FBI has never been asked to investigate State Department personnel files to assure their being intact and three affidavits are made in which affiants assert that they were hired specifically in 1946 to remove all "derogatory material" from these personnel files.

The majority concedes that the controversy has aroused public distrust and they want a body in the nature of the Hoover Commission to make a complete investigation, but the personnel would be named by the President, the Vice President (as President of the Senate), and the Speaker of the House, all Truman Democrats, good and true, Senator LODGE urges an eight-man commission, with reasonable safeguards against party domination.

There is only one clear and unchallengeable conclusion from the present report—there is a Democratic majority on the subcommittee.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 19, 1950]

CONVENIENT WHITWASH

The spectacular developments in Korea, which prompted the President to move dramatically to halt Communist aggression, have provided just what the Democrats needed to get out from under Senator McCARTHY's charges of Communists in Government. It was an "out" which they did not ignore for excellent political reasons, and they have made it formal by issuing a 350,000-word report on the findings of the Senate inquiry committee, headed by Senator TYDINGS.

The majority report, that, is the Democrat report, labeled the McCARTHY charges as a "fraud and a hoax," a "nefarious campaign of half-truths and untruths." Not one basic accusation was proved. Nothing questionable about the Amerasia case. A clean bill

of health for Lattimore, Jessup, Service, and Hanson. The administration in every aspect is clean as the proverbial hound's tooth. In short, McCARTHY cooked up the whole deal with nothing, absolutely nothing to support him.

Senator LODGE filed a minority report in which he agreed that the McCARTHY charges were "superficial and inconclusive"—as they were permitted to be explored. Senator HICKENLOOPER agreed in general with LODGE, but may have more to say later.

Despite the mountain of whitewash poured on the inquiry by the Democrats, we believe the public does not regard the McCarthy charges as groundless. Agreed, he did not develop them properly, he went into court inadequately prepared to prove his case, he swung aimlessly at times and his misses were just what the administration needed to exploit the utter falsity of his accusations.

For political reasons, the Democrats, including the President, placed every obstacle in McCARTHY's path. At no time did he receive even a semblance of cooperation from the administration. The Senate inquiry committee was flagrantly biased. And his fellow Republicans timidly stood on the sideline and waited to see what would happen. If he made good, "we did it." If he failed, "he was on his own." This was a cowardly attitude and the Democrats made the most of it.

Now comes the Korean police action, a dramatic challenge of communism by the President. With the Nation committed to back the President at every step, with mobilization for war staring us in the face, now is no time to expend our energies looking for past derelictions, which the Democrats say never existed. So, in the shadow of Korea, the Democrats brand McCARTHY as a wholesale liar and declare his crusade ended.

If McCARTHY has succeeded in scaring the President and his advisers into cleaning house, into getting rid of suspected subversives, into checking thoroughly into the loyalty of government personnel, his labors have not been in vain. And we believe he did just that. Perhaps 'tis well that the inquiry close its books now. But around those books is an aroma of red herrings that even Korea cannot dissipate. And now as ever before it is necessary to make certain that the Communist fifth column, in or out of Government, is under constant surveillance. The termites bear watching.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 21, 1950]

WHITWASH OF RED CHARGES

The report of the Senate subcommittee which "reviewed" the charges of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY was almost precisely what might have been expected. The Democratic majority of the committee devoted a great many thousands of words to an attack upon the Wisconsin Republican, without giving evidence of more than a cursory examination of his charges. Both of the minority members of the committee, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., of Massachusetts and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER of Iowa, declined to sign the report, and Senator LODGE issued one of his own, asserting that the committee's investigation had been "superficial."

Amid all the garish language of the majority report, here was little or nothing of concrete value in determining the validity of Senator McCARTHY's attack upon alleged Communist infiltration of the State Department. Even the staunch supporters of the administration who insisted that Senator McCARTHY discredited himself will be compelled to agree that the majority of the committee likewise tended to discredit themselves as impartial arbiters of his charges. During the progress of the hearings there was

at least one notable incident in which Chairman MILLARD TYDINGS betrayed remarkable prejudice in favor of those nominally under investigation. We use the phrase "nominally under investigation" because, in the case of Prof. Owen Lattimore, Chairman TYDINGS delivered a personal and virtually on the spot "vindication" of the Johns Hopkins University adviser on our far eastern policy.

In their comments on the Amerasia case, as in their remarks on the McCarthy charges, Senator TYDINGS and his Democratic associates almost impel the use of the word "white-wash." The public is left knowing scarcely what to believe about either matter. Whatever basis there may have been for the McCarthy allegations, he was given no help whatever by the committee in arriving at their truth or falsity. The subcommittee, at best, defied him to try to prove something. Had its conduct been a little more judicial—or investigative—the impact of its denial of all of his assertions would have been a great deal more forceful.

Indeed, the rhetorical fury of the committee's counterattack was not very persuasive. It will serve only to recall to most people that this is a congressional election year, and that, whether innocently or otherwise, the Asiatic phase of our foreign policy has reflected terrible discredit upon the administration's State Department.

There's a line in Shakespeare which might apply to the committee's majority report: "The lady doth protest too much!"

[From the Wheeling Intelligencer of July 19, 1950]

BUCKETS OF WHITEWASH

Senators MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, THEODORE F. GREEN, of Rhode Island, and BRIEN MAHON, of Connecticut—all Democrats—have surely laid the whitewash on with a lavish hand in an effort, political in intent and design, to escape from the very serious charges made against the United States State Department by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. They poured on the whitewash by the bucketfuls in the 850,000-word majority report they have just issued. It was expected, perhaps all that could be expected, in a campaign year, but the report, we believe, will someday torment its authors. The minority report, by the two Republican Senators of the investigative committee, is yet to be brought in.

Senator MCCARTHY fought his battle almost single-handed against terrific odds. As on other occasions when his opponents sought to shout him down, to smear him, and to put every conceivable roadblock in his pathway, the fates seemed to have conspired to assist Senator MCCARTHY. On the very day the report of the majority whitewashers was published, the FBI arrested still another alleged link in the Soviet espionage group whereby United States atomic secrets were transmitted to Moscow. And this latest accused person is described as a former associate engineering inspector of the United States Army Signal Corps who was removed because of information indicating Communist Party membership.

One of the most senseless and dubious steps ever taken by any Government was the admission of Communists into the Armed Forces of the United States when we were supposedly having a honeymoon as the pal of that ruthless and cynical world conspirator, Josef Stalin.

Senator TYDINGS and his Democratic committee associates can put the whitewash on thicker and thicker, but it is doubtful if they will deceive the thinking people of the United States.

Acheson, Lattimore, and Jessup are still mistrusted by many millions of American citizens, and the time will come, we are convinced, when Senator MCCARTHY will be fully vindicated.

[From the Illinois State Journal of July 21, 1950]

THE WHITEWASH

True to their tinged colors, subservient to orders from higher up, Senators TYDINGS, GREEN, and MAHON, all abject New Dealers, have brought in what purports to be their majority report of the subcommittee assigned to probe communism in Government. It absolves everyone whom Senator MCCARTHY, the fighting Wisconsin Republican, wanted truly investigated. But it goes further. It is a signal to Reds, both foreign and domestic, that they may work to undermine the American Republic without fear of molestation from the Truman regime. Moreover, it stands as a practical endorsement of the Communist fifth column in America, in everything it has done and may do.

Minority members of the subcommittee are Senators LODGE and HICKENLOOPER, both Republicans. Neither of these two had been allowed to read the Tydings report before it was made public, but Lodge, who often slants New Deal-wise in his voting, issued findings sharply differing from the three New Dealers' views. Significantly, Lodge asserted that the whole alleged probe was superficial and inconclusive, that the atmosphere too often was not that of seeking the truth and further that the subcommittee's record is a tangle of loose threads, of witnesses not subpoenaed, of leads not followed up. In a gentlemanly way, Lodge was saying that the whole performance was a fraud. Senator MCCARTHY was quick to analyze the report as a green light to the Red fifth column in the United States. Senator HICKENLOOPER withheld comment immediately, until he could study the TYDINGS whitewash.

In language both intemperate and unpatriotic, the report makes a personal issue of MCCARTHY, whose charges, TYDINGS says, are an organized campaign of vilification and abuse.

TYDINGS glossed over the testimony of Louis F. Budenz as hearsay, despite the fact that Budenz, the reformed Communist, was telling the subcommittee of his personal contacts and knowledge. He blocked off every effort MCCARTHY made to produce full and undeleted Government files, on which to prove points which MCCARTHY knew had substance. In short, not an effort was spared to make the investigation a fake and a fraud.

The American public now knows beyond every shadow of doubt the subversive atmosphere in which official Washington thrives. It has been asking, since American boys began to bleed and die in Korea, where the billions are that Communists have helped to squander. The public is aware that J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the FBI, only a few days ago warned that the menace of the Communist underground in the United States is the most threatening in American history. The public now will know that Truman's whole concept is to coddle the Communist vote in this country, and the country be damned. In this, he is joined by TYDINGS, LUCAS, and every other pawn of the dawning socialism.

The Tydings outfit, for the moment, has gotten away with its whitewash. Shortly, Americans will rub their eyes and begin to look Washington in the face. When they do, they are going to ask questions. They will want to know why American boys have been sent to their deaths by Truman against Communists in Korea, while Truman's congressional wheelps throw arms of safety and preference around Communists' shoulders at home. They will want to know whether, with thirteen to fourteen billions of tax dollars spent every year for defense, Communist influence has directed that most of this money be squandered or, more likely, that it be directed into foreign channels helpful to the Kremlin. They want to know why, with all the braying from every department head in

Washington, our boys were sent into battle stations in Korea without a chance.

The Tydings performance may be rated, for a few hours, as a political triumph. Long before November rolls around, it will have served the purpose of bringing out the Truman administration's true color. The hue is red.

AMERASIA, TOO

The Tydings triumvirate wasn't content with calling Senator MCCARTHY every name that reasonable etiquette would permit. It cleared everybody connected with the foul Amerasia scandal of 5 years ago, as well.

That case broke in June 1945, when FBI agents arrested Philip J. Jaffe, editor of the pro-Russian magazine, Amerasia, and found hundreds of secret and confidential Government documents. Five others landed in the FBI net, two of them State Department officials. Jaffe, whose Communist affiliations were well known, made a deal with the Department of Justice, in consequence of which he got off with a light fine. Then the incident was hushed up, and the traitors involved continued to operate as usual, except that the magazine was discontinued. It had been only a cover-up for the real business of stealing and transmitting top Government secrets to Russia, anyway.

The Tydings outfit concedes that the documents found in the Amerasia office were there illegally. But as for Jaffe's having "fixed" the token fine that was assessed against him, Tydings the protector throws up his hands in horror. Perish the thought!

Senator LODGE scored the Jaffe deal. "It is shocking that the Government should have made any deal at all with this man," Lodge averred. It was not only shocking, it was unnecessary. The FBI caught Jaffe and his Amerasia group red-handed. The stolen documents were there. Many of them bore upon highly confidential American defense plans.

Either the Amerasia case was "fixed" by the Government authorities then in charge, or it was glossed over because the administration was unwilling to offend Stalin and his Communists. In either event, the course was that of traitors.

NO MOOD TO FORGET

It ain't so, says the TYDINGS committee. Senator MCCARTHY's indictment of the State Department is "a fraud and a hoax." There is no evidence, absolutely none, to support the charges against Far Eastern Expert Owen Lattimore, Career Diplomat John S. Service, Ambassador Philip C. Jessup, or others named.

Strewn through the 350,000 words of the TYDINGS committee majority report are some mighty bitter phrases.

Senator MCCARTHY, the report avers, has been guilty of possibly "the most nefarious campaign of untruth" in American history. He has resorted to "gossip, distortion, hearsay and deliberate untruth." He has used the technique of the "big lie," in the Hitler-Stalin manner.

Furthermore:

There was nothing wrong with the way the Amerasia case was handled. No "agency of our Government" was derelict in any way. The fact that hundreds of secret papers belonging to the State Department were found in the offices of this pro-Communist magazine didn't mean anything.

Better forget the whole thing, and concentrate on the pleasant task of kicking Joe MCCARTHY. That appears to be the view of the majority members of the TYDINGS Committee.

The minority rebuttal is offered by Senator LODGE of Massachusetts, a left-wing Republican of internationalist leanings. If he had any preconceived opinions when the investigation began, it is fair to presume that

they were favorable to the State Department and hostile to Senator McCARTHY.

The Massachusetts Senator was saddened by the whole proceedings. In his report he agrees with the majority that McCARTHY did not prove his case. But he adds that the committee made no honest attempt to search for the truth.

The investigation, says Senator LODGE, "must be set down as superficial and inconclusive . . . a tangle of loose threads and leads which were never followed up."

In plainer words—a whitewash.

Senator LODGE particularly criticizes the committee for its "incomplete investigation" of the testimony of former Communist Leader Louis Budenz. The truth is there was no investigation whatever. Mr. Budenz, who has been the Government's key witness in recent Communist cases, charged that Owen Lattimore had been a Communist—and the committee yawned and did nothing further about it except to listen to Mr. Lattimore's denial.

As for the Amerasia case, says Senator LODGE, it was handled "in what appears to be a timid, almost apologetic manner."

What is the public to conclude from all this?

We think the argument over whether Owen Lattimore, or any other individual, ever carried a Red card saying "I am a Communist" is pointless, and will never be settled.

The important thing is not what men carry in their pockets, but what they carry in their heads.

Lattimore, Service, Jessup, and Dean Acheson—he is always in the background—were key members of the State Department clique which decided far-eastern policy. Without exception, until the Korean war started, they followed the Communist line.

This is their record:

At Potsdam, with neophyte President Truman, they surrendered Sakhalin, the Kuriles, Manchuria, and huge stores of Japanese arms, to the Communists. After Potsdam they expertly cut the throat of Chiang Kai-shek, first with ceaseless propaganda about the "corruption" of his regime, and second, with demands that he form a coalition with the Reds (as was done in Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc.). After the Reds had ejected Chiang from Asia this same precious crew bleated that Korea was "indefensible" and that Uncle Sam should never, never "interfere" in Formosa.

Those made-in-Moscow policies led directly to the tragedy now taking place in Korea. Young Americans are giving their lives in a desperate attempt to hold a line which the State Department for years tried and schemed to surrender.

Were the authors of these Red-leaning policies Communists? Or fellow travelers? Or merely Communist dupes?

What does it matter? Knowingly or not, they played Stalin's game. The time has come to kick them out and, for a change, get some leaders in Washington who will play America's game.

The Tydings committee apparently believes that if it cried "Fraud!" and "Hoax!" loudly enough at Senator McCARTHY, people will forget the betrayal of American interests in Asia by the Acheson-Lattimore, Service-Jessup axis.

If so, we think the Tydings committee is wrong. We think the people, sorrowfully watching events in Korea, are in no mood to forget.

[From the Arizona Daily Star of July 18, 1950]

OWEN LATTIMORE, SELF-REVEALED

During the past several months the name of Owen Lattimore has been featured in the news as a No. 1 Communist in the Department of State as a result of the charges made by Senator McCARTHY. Nothing definite to support the charges has been presented. Still many people have doubts, be-

cause they can remember how a similar situation developed after Alger Hiss first appeared in the news.

From the beginning the Star has said that, although Mr. Lattimore appeared to be sympathetic to numerous policies that favored the Soviet Union, it did not believe that he was a party member. Recently as a result of developments in Korea, passages from Mr. Lattimore's book, the Situation in Asia, published in 1949 have received notice. One on the situation in Korea is particularly pertinent. It reads as follows:

"The Russians organized a national army (in North Korea) grounding it on peasants who had land to defend and industrial workers who considered the new government their own, since it had been based on protection of their rights. The army was equipped with Russian, not captured Japanese, material.

"In South Korea the Americans organized, not a national army, but a constabulary, the backbone of which consists of men who served in the police under the Japanese—the most hated of all who collaborated with the Japanese. . . . Various enterprises have been nationalized, but have been staffed with personnel in political favor, whose outlook is not one of serving the state but of building individual property for themselves and eventually converting public into private property. . . . The army cannot be trusted to fight; the people do not trust the government; the government cannot be depended on, and does not depend on itself; it appeals for continued American occupation and protection.

"If there is to be a civil war . . . North Korea would be able to overrun South Korea without Russian help, unless stopped by American combat troops."

Those are prophetic words, but they are also revealing ones. They reveal Lattimore as one who thinks closely in sympathy with the Communist Party line, and as one who resorts to typical Communist propaganda tricks.

Let it be noted that he has only great praise and good to say for Communist Korea, and only biting scorn for the democracy of South Korea. Nowhere does he point out that North Korea is a cruel, efficient, Communist police state and that South Korea, as a new democracy, would be bound to show the usual weaknesses of a democracy.

He says that the North army was recruited from "peasants . . . and industrial workers who considered the new government their own, since it had been based on protection of their rights." Just to the contrary, he ridicules the South as an army recruited from the former Japanese constabulary.

How does he know so well that soldiers of the North feel the way he says they do? How does he know that the government of the North is protecting their rights? How does he imply that the Government of the South is not also protecting the rights of its soldiers and people? How can he say truthfully that the army of the South was a former Japanese constabulary, when its members were volunteers, 96,000 of them? Why does he present such a prejudiced picture of the South army and such a glowing one of the North?

He says not a word about how in the South all Japanese land holdings and all big estates had been divided among the actual tillers of the soil, and that productivity in agriculture and industry were increasing rapidly. He says not a word about how in the South men were free to criticize, free to choose their representatives to a national assembly and not limited to a one-party ticket. He says not a word about the thousands of refugees who escaped from the North, how the United Nations Commission was not free to inspect the North but could go anywhere in South Korea.

Mr. Lattimore falls into regular Communist lingo when he writes about the partial nationalization of industries in the South. He says they "have been staffed with personnel in political favor, whose outlook is not one of serving the state but of building individual property for themselves and eventually converting public into private property."

The implications of that statement are that industry must be public property. People must serve the state. That is a demand that Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini always made. Private property is wrong, as is a free society. Lattimore has not a word to say about how everything that was to be done in South Korea was being done under the supervision of American advisers.

Lattimore's words about the fighting qualities of the two armies sound prophetic, but he fails to inform that the Russians had no scruples about furnishing their satellite with modern tanks, plenty of good artillery and modern aviation. He ignores completely that we denied such weapons to the South Koreans, because they might be considered "offensive."

Today we are seeing that not even American soldiers can stop tanks and planes with rifles and machine guns.

Why did Lattimore fail, as a scholar, to present such facts?

He says not a word about how the South Koreans were forbidden to call for the unification of their country, but the North Koreans could. In the name of democracy we Americans denied the South the right to make that appeal that beats in the breast of every Korean.

In the past the Star has defended Mr. Lattimore. It now, as a result of what he writes in his book, distrusts him. He is no longer entitled to respect as a man of intellectual integrity. He has no business being a confidential adviser to our Government.

[From the Indianapolis Times of June 30, 1950]

SMELLIER AND SMELLIER

Senator TYDINGS, McMAHON, and GREEN are trying to get away with a fast one.

Apparently they think it's smart Democratic politics to close up the Amerasia investigation in a hurry while public attention is on the awesome developments of the Korean war.

By a vote of 3 to 2 they have overridden Republican committeemen, Senators LODGE and HICKENLOOPER, and ordered the committee staff to draft what they call an "Interim report"—though it is obvious that Senators TYDINGS, McMAHON, and GREEN do not intend to call any more witnesses or uncover any more unsavory facts in the Amerasia mess.

Senators LODGE and HICKENLOOPER have a right to be indignant, as they are. They have a right to denounce the committee majority's outrageous steamroller tactics from the Senate floor, as we trust they will.

From the start of this sorry imitation of an investigation, Senators TYDINGS, McMAHON, and GREEN have acted like men trying to keep the truth of the Amerasia affair from being brought out into the broad light of day.

In our opinion, they have been all too clever. Neither the Congress nor the public can have any confidence in any report they sign. They have played hide-and-seek, opening committee hearings to present one side of the picture, closing committee doors to prevent the public from hearing the other side.

Their chief counsel, Edward Morgan, in cross-examining witnesses accused of improper conduct, has acted like a defense attorney—following somewhat the same pattern as the original Justice Department prosecutor on the Amerasia defendants. They muzzled the Republican counsel, Robert Morris, when he tried to ask the right questions.

And now Messrs. TYDINGS, McMAHON, and GREEN are trying to shut off proceeding without calling the most important witnesses.

Among the important uncalled witnesses are Laughlin Currie, Thomas Corcoran, Ben Cohen, Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, and Judge James M. Proctor.

EXHIBIT 4

[From Life magazine of July 24, 1950]

JOHNSON OR ACHESON?

In the last 2 weeks or so, while inadequate American forces were being beaten back in Korea, it looked as if Louis Johnson would have to take the rap. But to put the biggest part of the blame on the Secretary of Defense is to judge matters superficially. Our weakness in the West Pacific was caused by fundamental errors. These fundamental errors were the errors of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

Johnson is wide open to criticism. He made much too much blather about economizing, and a case could be made for his retirement. But he was carrying out the orders of the President. It was Truman who scuttled a minimum adequate defense program in 1948, and this year, when Congress wanted to reinstate some of the cuts, he opposed it.

Nevertheless the fundamental reason that we were so unprepared to meet the Red attack is that Acheson refused to face the dangers of the Communist advance in Asia. He offered the military chiefs a phony choice: all-out commitment of United States strength to anti-Communist forces in Asia or no effective resistance at all. Naturally the military men, hamstrung by economy cuts, backed away. Discouraged, they made no plans for fighting communism in Asia.

It was Acheson who was Truman's chief adviser on basic policy, and Acheson was also Truman's chief alibi-ist. It was Acheson, not Johnson, who befriended Alger Hiss and was mixed up with the Owen Lattimore crowd in the State Department who stupidly or deliberately played into Communist hands in Asia. Johnson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were for sending a mission to Formosa; it was Acheson who persuaded Truman to override them. Acheson would not only have let Formosa go to the Communists, he might have recognized the Communist Government of China, if he could have got away with it—and he still might.

The country can have no confidence in the conduct of our struggle against communism in Asia as long as Acheson is Secretary of State. Acheson should go.

ERRONEOUS POSTULATES OF COMMUNIST PHILOSOPHY—ARTICLE BY ERWIN D. CANHAM

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). Just a moment: In his capacity as a Senator from Wisconsin the Chair wants to make a statement on his own behalf, and he then wants also to clear up a little misunderstanding which has occurred in relation to the question as to who should be recognized. But before doing that, the Chair wishes to say that it is not very often, in these days, that one can turn to a newspaper or a magazine and find an article that is worthy of the philosophy of a Plato or a Socrates. But the Chair had that experience recently, and in view of his colleague's speech today, he wants to ask unanimous consent to place the article in the RECORD. It is an article entitled

"The Authentic Revolution," by Erwin D. Canham, and was published in the Christian Science Monitor. The Chair merely wants to read one or two paragraphs from the article because while today we have been centering our attention on the mistakes we have made, or have been making, in the Far East, but here, it is good to note, and this will be especially good for Mr. Barrett, as head of the Voice of America section, to note—

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, may I first ask—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair finish.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I just came into the Chamber. I am at a loss to understand the procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The procedure is that the Senator from Wisconsin has recognized himself for 3 minutes to put something in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator ask consent to do that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; he asks unanimous consent as a Senator to insert something in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Did any Senator reserve the right to object? I should say it is an extraordinary procedure. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Oregon thinks the senior Senator from Wisconsin is engaging in debate. The Chair is not doing that. The Chair wants to place something in the RECORD, because he has tried for 3 or 4 days on the floor to get something in the RECORD, and other Senators have been occupying the floor for so long that now the Presiding Officer, as a Senator from Wisconsin, is going to put this in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT entered the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Following which, the Chair will recognize the Vice President. The Chair asks unanimous consent that this article, written by Erwin D. Canham, be placed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I wonder if I may be allowed to ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Wisconsin may introduce into the RECORD the article which he wanted to introduce while he was the Presiding Officer. I objected. I did so most kindly, because I am very fond of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. I objected because I thought it would be a violation of the rules of the Senate for him to introduce anything into the RECORD while presiding over the Senate. While presiding he is acting for the Vice President as the Presiding Officer of the Senate. It is clear that as the Presiding Officer he is not free to engage in the legislative work of the Senate. That is why I objected to his introducing it while he occupied the chair. I did so in order to keep what I think must be

kept pure—the rules of the Senate. Now I should like to ask unanimous consent to have my good friend from Wisconsin introduce the article from the floor, from where I thought it should have been offered in the first instance.

Mr. WILEY. I cannot agree with the technical attitude of my good friend from Oregon, but I agree that he is a pretty good fellow. I have seen a Presiding Officer do the very same thing several times. I did not do it as the Presiding Officer, as I indicated at the time. I offered the article as a Senator from Wisconsin. I asked if there was objection to my doing it, and the Senator from Oregon objected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "The Authentic Revolution," written by Erwin D. Canham, and published in the Christian Science Monitor magazine section of July 15, 1950. I call particular attention to the significance of this article and to some of the quotations included therein.

Charles Malik, Minister from Lebanon to the United States, has well said:

To the superficial observer who is unable to penetrate to the core of love and truth which is still at the heart of the West, there is little to choose between the soulless materialism of the West and the militant materialism of the East.

Mr. Malik tells us further that we must not simply export our flourishing political institutions, our happy human relations, our reputation for wealth and prosperity, or our expert advice and technical assistance, but to be able to lead and save others we must export the great ideas of our minds, our great truths rooted in the Graeco-Roman-Hebrew-Christian-western European humane outlook.

In this article Mr. Canham gives the three basic erroneous postulates of the Communist philosophy. He concludes with the challenge to all of us to get across the right ideas and the right way of life, instead of simply the materialistic concepts.

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

THE AUTHENTIC REVOLUTION—WE ARE THE GREAT REVOLUTIONARIES, AND OUR REVOLUTION IS A SPIRITUAL ONE

(By Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

I

Let me tell you my thesis bluntly at the outset.

It is that the struggle for the salvation of free society in our time will be lost unless we in the West—and particularly we in the United States—awaken to and project the fact that we are the great revolutionaries in world history, and that our revolution is basically a spiritual one which we have already proved in action.

We have let most of the world think that the American achievement is primarily materialistic. This is the great gap between ourselves and those who yearn for much more than materialism. And we are the first victims ourselves of the misunderstanding.

The misunderstanding concerning America which is so pervasive in the world today is the key to the future of western society.

For, as Charles Malik, Minister of Lebanon to the United States, has well said: "To the superficial observer who is unable to penetrate to the core of love and truth which is still at the heart of the West, there is little to choose between the soulless materialism of the West and the militant materialism of the East."

And, as Mr. Malik further told us in the West: "If your only export in these realms is the silent example of flourishing political institutions and happy human relations, you cannot lead. If your only export is a distant reputation for wealth and prosperity and order, you cannot lead. Nor can you really lead if you send forth to others only expert advice and technical assistance. To be able to lead and save yourself and others, you must, above everything else, address your mind and soul. Your tradition, rooted in the glorious Graeco-Roman-Hebrew-Christian-western European human outlook, supplies you with all the necessary presuppositions for leadership. All you have to do is to be the deepest you already are."

There is the challenge of the hour. These are not challenges requiring the postulating of new fundamentals. They call for no panaceas. It is a call to awakening and to articulation. The basic need is to understand and to proclaim the truth. The West must find its voice.

Let us, therefore, ask ourselves a few fundamental questions. Let us proclaim the truth on the issues which confront the world. Mankind today is being told it must choose between revolution and reaction. It is told that communism represents revolution, and that our system—which is opprobriously called capitalism—represents reaction. In such a confrontation, there would be no choice. Mankind must go forward. But this statement of the issue is an explicit reversal of the truth.

The fact is that communism—like totalitarianism in any form—represents the blackest of reactions. The fact is that the free system, of which capitalism is only a small and modified part, represents the authentic revolution—not a subversive revolution, but a revolution which sets men free.

We in the Western World are the true standard-bearers of a great and emancipating doctrine. But we have allowed ourselves to be thrust into the indefensible position of seeking to protect the status quo. The free system is by no means the same thing as the status quo. Our tradition is not static, but is constantly dynamic. Our tradition strikes off chains. Totalitarianism would put them back on again.

The stirring battle cry which ends the Communist manifesto is itself a delusion. Marx and Engels wrote: "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win." Where, in today's world, are most people in chains? Is it in the United States, where what is perhaps the most enlightened labor contract in history was recently signed by our largest industrial corporation and one of our largest trade-unions? Or is it in the world's most extensive Communist state, the Soviet Union, where tragic millions, suffering and dying, are bearing the literal chains of slave labor? Is it in Britain, where labor's own government is in power and is carrying through the most extensive peaceful and gradual social revolution in history? Where are the chains today? Where are the mental chains? Are they in the free universities and the free churches of the Western World? Or are they in the Communist states, where man's right to think is now denied on behalf of the omnipotent state, and free science or free religion has ceased to exist?

II

These are among the facts to which we must awaken.

But let us come at our task in an orderly way. Let us first ask ourselves, in the most searching possible fashion, what are the chief claims of communism, and let us confront these statements with the best truth we know. Then let us examine the two doctrines—communism and western democracy—in actual practice, to test their words by their works. And, finally, let us chart a plan of campaign in this great battle of truth against falsehood.

First, what are communism's basic postulates?

The primary claim of communism—the foundation stone on which it rests—is that of dialectical materialism. It is the assertion that ultimate reality lies in matter, and in matter alone. But the truth as we know it is that superior to matter in every way is the reality of mind and of spirit. In our time an awakening to the metaphysical bankruptcy of materialism is beginning to sweep over thoughtful mankind. The awakening is most striking among the natural scientists. They are finding, in the realm of the very little and of the very large—of the infinitesimal and of the infinite—that old materialistic assumptions are no longer valid. Reality is now by them recognized to be related to consciousness. Time and space are seen to be dependent upon consciousness. Reality is emerging more and more to today's thinker as the basic essence which lies behind and beneath the material manifestation. In short, not the chair of wood and wicker, but the idea of chair existing in consciousness, is seen to come closer to ultimate reality.

There is an even more striking and topical proof of the bankruptcy of materialism. Men have wrought the most powerful engines in their experience; from gunpowder and steam and electricity they have progressed to atomic power. And yet they now see that the power to help or harm mankind lies not in the atom itself, not in the uranium or plutonium or tritium, but in the thinking that motivates the finger which does or does not push the button that does or does not set off these fearful engines of destruction. In the words of a great Yale natural scientist, Dr. Edmund W. Sinnott, "Man, not matter, is the chief problem of mankind today."

The second great lie of communism walks hand in hand with the first. It is that there is no God. Today we have the opportunity of knowing as never before that there is indeed a God, who is the loving Father of all mankind. We do not necessarily have to identify God merely with the single three-letter name, G-o-d. Perhaps it is useful to redefine God as the central principle of the universe. Perhaps it helps to think of Him as Eternal Truth and Life and Love. These things cannot be denied. We know the universe is orderly. We know that it works according to established rules and principles, some of which we have been able to partially define. It seems to me to be rationally impossible to recognize the reality of an orderly universe and to deny God.

Still further to disprove Communist dialectic, take the assertions that there is no objective and eternal truth, and that only the transient and the temporal exist. I am sure that we in the Western World can readily prove to our satisfaction that there is truth, and that it is transcendent. Again we can prove it in the working of the laws of the universe. Or we can prove it in the vast and noble reaches of the mind and the heart. There is abundant evidence of the existence of permanent and imminent values. These are accessible to mankind through a humble search for understanding. They come through the path of reason as well as down the road of revelation. They lift mankind out of its own confusions and perversities. They are to be confirmed not only in the religious convictions and teachings of mankind, but in the positive philosophical

traditions of Plato and Aristotle, of Hegel and Whitehead.

Finally we come to another great Communist falsehood: That the individual exists for the sake of society and the state. This lie follows logically from the assertion of materialism and the denial of eternal truth and order. It is the specific doctrine which enslaves mankind. And yet the truth as we know it and prove it in action daily is that the state and society exist for the sake of the individual. It is this Communist lie which stifles the spirit of man. It is totalitarianism. It is contrary to nature and to man. Again in the eloquent words of Dr. Malik: "That the state, the mere organ of government and order, is the source of every law, every truth, every norm of conduct, every social and economic relationship; that no science, no music, no economic activity, no philosophy, no art, no theology, is to be permitted except if it is state-licensed and state controlled; all of this is so false, so arrogant, so autocratic, and tyrannical that no man who has drunk deep from the living waters of the western Platonic-Christian tradition can possibly accept it. The state does not come in first place; it comes in tenth or fifteenth place. The university is higher than the state; the tradition of free inquiry is higher than the state; the church is higher than the state; the family is higher than the state; natural law is higher than the state; God is higher than the state; within limits, free economic activity is higher than the state."

It is good that Dr. Malik should have recognized not only the spiritual importance of church and university and family, but of free economic activity as well. For this brings us to the crux of our problem today. It is the free economic activity of the West which is most under fire in the contemporary world. It is this free economic activity which is used by those who hate it or misunderstand it to brand the West with the stigma and curse of materialism. The need, therefore, is for an awakening to the spiritual obligation and heritage of the free economic system.

III

Let us, then, proceed to the second of our main points: an examination of communism and the free economic system as they reveal themselves in action.

It is not necessary, first of all, to belittle the actual achievements of the Soviet state. Historic objectivity requires us to recall the importance of the transition from czarism, the achievement of partial industrialization in the face of two wars. In a certain narrow framework the Soviet state has accepted a large obligation to the individuals who make it up. It has gone a long way toward harmonizing the diverse interests of widely separated and scattered racial and cultural groups. In World War II the Red army under Marshal Stalin helped greatly in resisting and defeating a powerful aggressor.

It is important to recognize, also, that we have to live with the Russians, and many of the things we find dangerous in the present Soviet state are traits and trends which long antedate communism. We must find ways of adjusting ourselves to life with an awakened Eurasian continent. It is, perhaps, a blessing for mankind that the awakening and industrialization of this vast area has come about under a system which inevitably handicaps and limits its potential achievement. Sometimes one is appalled at the aggressive possibilities of a Russian empire organized with the efficiency and power of industrialized Britain in the nineteenth century or the United States in the twentieth century. A great natural scientist, Dr. Merle Tuve, recently remarked that the greatest single discovery of World War II was the efficiency of the free system. That kind of efficiency coupled with the natural resources and the

immense racial dynamism of the people now under the hammer and sickle would make a world force of incalculable potential.

Communism has partly liberated and partly stifled this great capacity. On balance, at the point of the midcentury, there is far more of stifling than there is of liberation. When, as I believe to be inevitable, the Russian peoples are finally and genuinely liberated, we must be ready with a universal system of peace and order. Otherwise, they will be an explosive force against which today's communism will be a pallid squib. Fortunately, there is also in the Russian people a great and magnificent spiritual and universal yearning. The free Russian soul, in all its exuberance, longs for human brotherhood and bears a heavy burden of anguish for the spiritual failure of humankind. These deep impulses have helped to support communism. They would be far more effective in support of a free system wrought for the benefit of all mankind. The Russian need for religion has partially and temporarily accepted communism as a religion. When the Russian spirit is ultimately freed, it must find its way fully into the spiritual pastures of the great western tradition of truth and love. Otherwise, Russia might remain the world's great challenge for long and turbulent years—far more dangerously than in our own time, when Russia is self-curbed by a hopelessly inefficient and inhibiting system. Even under the present limitations, it is unnecessary to add that the Russian achievement is considerable.

But on balance the system remains one of chains and of slavery. It remains reaction, of the pattern of all the tyrannies that have sought to bind the free spirit of man and to withhold his natural rights down through the millennia. The fact is that communism in its works is both spiritually and materially sterile. It is fundamentally a failure, because it is unable to utilize more than the merest fraction of the forces which are available. It is the most profligate destroyer of human resources. Its concentration camps and its mass graves are filled with the richest of human talent. Those who survive are denied the immense productive force of free inquiry, of objective experiment, and of full self-analysis.

Against all this, contrast the actual achievement of the free system of the West. The American economy—derided and attacked by its enemies—is today holding the line against world collapse. With all the faults which we know full well lie within our society and in its economic organization, the fact remains that the world today would be in chaos without the stability and productivity of the United States.

I am not here seeking to put a halo around the profit motive; far from it. The first and most important thing to say about the free economic system is that it can survive only to the degree that the individuals and combinations that make it up accept their social obligation.

Moreover, there is a considerable difference between much of the economic organization that passes by the name of capitalism in some parts of the world and the best of the free economic system which enlightened leadership has brought into being in the United States and elsewhere. In many places overseas, when we defend capitalism we defend a feudal or a cartel concept which would appall the thoughtful American business enterpriser. In some places, it is true, a sense of social obligation has dawned. We are not necessarily committed to the task of putting Humpty-Dumpty together again. But it is essential for us to put the importance of social obligation first, and not place ourselves in the position of advocating the return of industrial or financial feudalism.

IV

The free economic system in the United States, and measurably in many other parts of the world—including, particularly, the smaller states where neutrality and/or co-operation have supported much real equality and high standards of living—can be objectively left to stand or fall on its own merits. It stands. It stands because it has given more opportunity to the individual than any other system ever tried. It stands because it is perfectible. It is not dogmatic—or should not be. It should always recognize the imperatives of self-criticism and of change. It should remember the paramountcy of human values. But these are not values of social security alone.

There are serious shortcomings in the idea of security, taken as an ultimate value. No society which enshrined security as an end in itself was able long to continue the march of progress. Dissatisfaction, adversity, risk—these are the imperatives of progress. Furthermore, to enshrine security as an end in itself, and to place its procurement and maintenance in the hands of the state, is to say that the state is above the individual. That is the road of slavery; of social suicide. We must keep the individual and the individual-based forms of organization as our primary values; man and church and school, along with family and free economic activity. The state owes nobody a living. At the same time, it is necessary and effective to organize through the state the various functions which the individual or private organizations cannot accomplish. It goes without saying that insurance barriers against the hazards of the economic system, old age or unemployment, are accepted and legitimate parts of collective responsibility. That form of social security can be kept in its proper place.

But the increasing sense of dependence of the individual upon the state is not the obverse of the needful recognition of social obligation. It is, however, often the result of the failure of free enterprise to recognize its social obligation. In an industrial society, dominated by mass production, the individual is peculiarly insecure. He will seek the means of survival through collective action. For the laborer and artisan, protection comes through unions and government. Sometimes it comes through a cooperative relationship with his employer, which is best of all. For the employer, protection also comes through collective action, sometimes private and sometimes in governmental laws and procedures. But we have made great progress in evolving forms which are consistent both with free enterprise and with the special hazards of an industrial society. And again I must emphasize that these forms work best when they are founded upon a voluntary and perceptive acceptance of social obligation. That is the final and indispensable bulwark of the free system.

The fruits of the system are expressed in material and spiritual terms. Altogether too often we have remembered only the material rewards. We boast of our standard of living, and when we go abroad the dollars clink in our pockets. We are sometimes obsessed with material gain and with unrestrained selfishness. We have been our own worst salesmen, for we have convinced most of the rest of the world that we are money-mad materialists. But the greatest fruitage of the free system is spiritual. It stands in the recognition of the essential dignity of man which is implicit in equality of opportunity. It lies in the concept of legitimate service.

Perhaps you will understand me when I say, not too whimsically, that the American filling station is a very good illustration of the triumph of the free system. It is not the mechanical excellence of the filling station which is its chief virtue. It is its spirit.

There are an enthusiasm and a self-respect which have infused the filling station and made it one of the most successful of our various institutions. I do not altogether know why this is so, I merely point out that our free economic system at its best has gone a long way toward the enshrining of human values and the attainment of a genuinely democratic relationship between server and served. I do not think anyone will deny that this is a spiritual value.

Something of the same achievement was illustrated the other day by the words of a German editor who recently had an opportunity to visit the United States. He was taken to a small eastern city as the guest of a local newspaper. I asked him how he liked it and what he had learned. He put it in these words: "The best thing was that they introduced me to everybody, and they introduced me to the lift boy just the same way they introduced me to the mayor."

Awareness of the individual importance of man is our greatest achievement. It lies at the heart of the matter. Recognizing the significance of individual man, we have been able to mobilize and utilize the vast and still uncounted and uncountable resources of the human spirit. This is an accomplishment of revolutionary importance. It springs from the circumstances under which Europeans first came to the New World; it is based upon the political and ideological and spiritual roots of our society. It is genuine democracy. Established in the midst of the natural resources of a continent, it has enabled us to become a material and spiritual bastion for the safeguarding of western civilization. We have been able to achieve the adequate blending of natural and human resources, and while we have wasted natural resources often in a profligate manner, we have come to utilize human resources within enterprising but humane bounds. This is illustrated by our rejection of child labor on the one hand and our increasingly wide opportunities for women on the other. But I would not gild the lily. There are plenty of dark spots in our human experience, as we have moved toward fuller light. There are dark spots today. They are part of the challenge, part of the incentive, part of the unfinished business without which we would decline and perish.

V

And that brings us to our third point: a plan of campaign in the war of ideas. The first necessity is manifestly self-awakening. We must rediscover the ideas by which we live. The ideology of communism is well known and widely proclaimed. It is passionately believed by many of those who proclaim it. This awareness and intensity is integrated and guided. There is no comparable intensity or coordination of ideas among those who believe in the free system. There will not be until we look at our heritage in fundamental terms and arouse ourselves to its revolutionary import today. The obligation of every citizen, of every leader, is to awaken himself and to awaken his fellow man to the significance of today's challenge.

The second necessity, after the awakening, is the voice. Already there are various small voices from the free nations—voices seeking to penetrate the void of human thinking. They must rise to full articulation. We possess today mighty machines for disseminating ideas to every corner of the globe. But we have not yet learned what we have to say. In fact, the message we must say is the same old message of truth down the ages: the significance of man under God, of his brotherhood, of his birthright of freedom.

The third necessity, along with the awakening and the voice, is the fuller demonstration of the free system in action. There is contagion in falsehood. Some of

the lies of totalitarianism and materialism have penetrated into our own thinking. We must not let them stay there. In this unhealthy atmosphere of no peace, no war, we have yielded some citadels to the enemy. Some have sought to weaken or destroy the free spirit of inquiry and of teaching in our schools and universities. Happily, enough have seen the truth clearly and have prevented the sabotage of our educational institutions. In these bewildering times we have yielded to distrust of human character, and the cloud of suspicion—often of slander—hangs heavy over the human spirit. We must learn again to trust character, because free institutions depend upon respect for fellow man. We must spurn the corrosive doubts which do far more harm to our body politic than the dangers to which they pertain. We must, as I have said earlier, manifest social responsibility throughout our economic system. We must make swifter progress toward the removal of racial and religious barriers which prevent true community. These are but a few of our items of unfinished business—of our ways of proving in action the truth by which alone we live.

And, finally, let us regain perspective, let us cast off the inferiority complex with which communism has bemused us, let us reaffirm a consciousness of our birthright.

We stand in human history as the greatest revolutionaries of all time. Not just we Americans—but all of us in the Western World.

We are the guardians of a sacred and dynamic heritage. We have come a long way. We have a long way to go.

We have discovered long since the eternal truth of love and peace and brotherhood. We have discovered and in a measure applied the enormous potency of the freeman.

We have lifted part way the heavy burden of toil that has crushed humanity down through the years, and more gloriously we have begun to lift the curtain of ignorance which has blanketed the human mind.

We are on the march.

And today we are challenged. For the challenge we may be infinitely grateful. Because our society today faces adversity. There is a hill up which we must climb. We will not decline in slothful ease. We will pit ourselves against the lies which in our time assault the deep foundations of truth. These lies cannot prevail, even to the extent of setting civilization into a relapse, if we are worthy of our heritage.

And we can and will be worthy of that heritage if and as we awaken. The voice of no one of us is powerful enough to awaken all the slumberers in today's world.

It is our individual and collective duty to think these things through for ourselves, and in our free way to help our brother man to his needful awareness. Let us pass along the message of freedom. One day it will reach critical mass and a chain reaction will begin.

Meantime, we must preserve the physical defenses of the Western World by keeping military aggression at bay; we must strengthen the economic sinews and the stability of the free world; we must lead our civilization to higher plateaus of demonstrated freedom and achievement.

And from the valley below, those who have accepted the false doctrines of totalitarianism of the right or the left will one day see the heights to which we have ascended and will join us on the continuous pathway ahead.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill

(S. 3937) to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States.

STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was walking through the door into the Chamber, and therefore does not know which Senator first addressed the Chair. For what purpose do the two Senators rise?

Mr. McMAHON. I rise to talk for about 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under those conditions, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Chair requested the two Senators to state for what purpose they rose, I should like to have an opportunity to state it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I rise for the purpose of obtaining the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut, because he says he only wants 3 minutes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, we have listened to the junior Senator from Wisconsin discuss the report of the subcommittee on foreign relations regarding employee loyalty in the State Department. He stated, and I am sure he did not mean to, that the committee had cleared Mr. Remington. Mr. Remington's case was not considered by the committee, because he was never an employee of the State Department.

The Senator from Wisconsin has also read to the Senate and placed in the RECORD an investigative report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on one of the cases which the Senator submitted to the subcommittee. He has crossed out the name of the subject. I was able, however, to identify the man in question, and I have received from him permission to place in the RECORD some 21 affidavits as to his loyalty, patriotism, and integrity. I must do the necessary clerical work of crossing out the man's name wherever it appears.

I should like to read an excerpt from the first affidavit in the file given by a man and wife of undisputed ability, integrity, and patriotism. It is rather a lengthy affidavit, but I should like the Senate to get the benefit of two or three paragraphs of it, because they are somewhat illuminating. I read:

Since ——— was Russian born, we were especially interested in his views regarding Soviet development, and would have quickly detected any Communist sympathies, if he had any, no matter how cleverly they might have been concealed, for in a long, intimate relationship there are many unguarded moments when, in words, or gestures, or facial expressions, the deepest thoughts and feelings of friends are revealed. We have heard from him and his parents about his early childhood in Russia, particularly during the revolution, when his family were refugees. They had nothing in common with revolutionists. In analyzing Soviet developments, ——— has, however, been clear-headed and objective. His views on the Soviet Union

have not been prejudiced by emotional considerations arising from the fact that he was denied the heritage of a native homeland. His intellectual discipline was of too high a standard to have permitted it. He has regarded Soviet developments in the light of basic social forces and world trends.

We discussed at great length the significance of Russia's turn against Germany and her alignment with the democracies. His view, which, if publicly expressed at the time, would have constituted a serious indiscretion, and that the Second World War had come to be not at all a conflict between two ideologies or ways of life but rather a conflict between Germany and Russia for leadership of a totalitarian movement (fascism vs. communism), leaving the question of totalitarianism versus democracy to be fought out later between the United States and Russia. He recognized, however, that our choice was to face the prospect of a second bout, against Russia, or run the risk of losing the first bout against Germany, and was accordingly reconciled to our alliance with the Soviet Union. The point is that ——— and his wife, who shared his views, were privately not sympathetic toward Russia at the time when expressions of pro-Soviet sympathies were popular.

The ——— were not without a sense of humor, however, regarding the Communist experiment in Russia. We recall in particular a book which they lent us, written by two Russians, with the title of *The Little Golden Calf*, the amusing situations in which were based on the corruption and incredible stupidity of Soviet officials and administrators. It was a source of delight to ——— that the book, written in the early twenties by approved Communist authors, achieved such popularity in the Soviet Union that the Government, after discovering its subtle satire on the Soviet regime, was unable to effect its suppression.

It is also recalled that among other books which the ——— lent us was a novel of outstanding merit regarding Soviet Russia, *Darkness at Noon*, by Koestler, which is the most convincing and devastating commentary on the Communist regime which we have read. It is devastating for the reason that, although the author, like ———, is able to present with tolerance and understanding the social grievances which have fostered the rise of communism, he, like ———, is quick to point out with equal objectivity the logical consequences of the Communist philosophy and course of action; namely, the enslavement of the individual, or, if he resists, his extermination.

It is perhaps conceivable that unsophisticated persons, impressed only by emotional manifestations, might have, through ignorance, mistaken ——— intellectual objectivity toward Russia as a symptom of Communist sympathy. It is not conceivable, however, that anyone capable of a rational approach to social problems and their solutions could interpret ——— views regarding Russia as anything but deeply and emphatically opposed to communism and Communists' activities.

We have known ——— as a wife and mother, extremely devoted to her husband and children, and as a highly intelligent person interested chiefly in the arts, rather than in political, social, or economic matters. We have observed that in regard to such matters she shares her husband's views. It would be difficult to believe that, in view of the exceptionally close and harmonious relations between her and her husband, she could hold political views differing substantially from those of her husband.

I, Betty Carr, have discussed with ———, among other subjects of usual interest to women, problems of child training and care and know that she strongly

opposes regimentation and tries to encourage in her children the spirit of individualism. She, as well as her husband, believes strongly in the institution of the family and in the institution of private property on which it is in a large part based.

On the basis of our long and intimate relationship with _____ and _____, we are convinced that they are not Communists, that they are not in sympathy with Communist philosophy, objectives, or activities, and that they can be completely trusted as loyal Americans, faithful and devoted to the political, economic, and social principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States. In fact, we cannot conceive on what basis their loyalty might be questioned, and are deeply distressed that such a statement as this should be necessary.

Mr. President, this is one of 21 affidavits bearing upon the subject's loyalty. One of the most distinguished Members of this body, who does not sit on this side of the aisle, but on the other side of the aisle, has an affidavit in this file as to this man's Americanism as of 1938.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator give the name of that Senator?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; I intend to place the affidavit in the RECORD. I refer to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. This man worked for the junior Senator from Oregon on a project in the Department of Justice in 1938.

This is an example of the situation about which I spoke several days ago. If we take simply one part of a file and say that on the basis of it, without any hearings, without giving the accused an opportunity to appear and offer evidence to contradict the evidence given, then I say that if we stand for that system we have denied one of the basic and fundamental propositions which we hold to be basically American.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I shall not yield. I have sat here for 3 hours, it is now 3:30 p. m. and I have not had any lunch. I shall place this matter in the RECORD, and then I shall get some lunch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the 21 affidavits bearing upon this subject, which, of course, were weighed by the Loyalty Board, in addition to all the other material in the file, be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, unless the Senator will show me the name on the affidavit, to see whether it is the same individual whom I mentioned, I shall have to object. Otherwise, I would have no way of knowing whether it is the same individual.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator wish to look at the affidavit?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, while the Senator is looking at the affidavit, let me say that he has also referred to a gentleman by the name of Theodore Geiger, an ECA employee. Mr. Geiger was the subject of some attention by our assistant counsel, Mr. Morris.

I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a letter written on the letterhead of the Economic Cooperation Ad-

ministration, signed by William Foster as Acting Administrator, dated July 6.

I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he has found that the name in the affidavit which I handed him is that of the same individual he had in mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. The last name is the same, and the first name is the same.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator understands that I shall delete the names as I put the affidavits into the RECORD. It is quite regrettable that the Senator from Wisconsin, when he put in a part of the file, was not able to give us the rest of the file, so that we could have both sides of the case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the 21 affidavits will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McMAHON. The letter from Mr. Foster, which is addressed to the chairman of the so-called Tydings-McMahon committee, reads:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1950.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: In connection with your inquiry of July 3, 1950, concerning Theodore Geiger, an ECA employee, I would like to state that he has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such an investigation is required by section 110 (c) of Public Law 472, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, which prescribes as follows:

"(c) No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned under this title for a period to exceed 3 months unless such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State and the Administrator, and until the Secretary of State or the Administrator has certified in writing (and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs) that, after full consideration of such report, he believes such individual is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and form of government, and is not now and has never been a member of any organization advocating contrary views."

In accordance with these provisions of the law and after full consideration of the information developed, Mr. Hoffman certified in writing his belief as to the loyalty of Mr. Geiger.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Acting Administrator.

It will be recalled that the Geiger case was referred to as one which had been suppressed and covered up, and upon which the people of the United States had been misled. I do not think that Mr. William Foster or Mr. Paul Hoffman, who are gentlemen whose friendship I am privileged to enjoy, are the kind of Americans who would engage in the sort of conspiracy which has been alleged here, namely, keeping an improper person in the employ of the Government of the United States. They would no more do that than would Gen. Conrad Snow do it. General Snow is the head of the Loyalty Board of the State Department, which passes on these cases. General Snow's loyalty and patriotism and in-

tegrity and ability were certified to by no one else than the second ranking minority Member of this body, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The Senator's statement will be found in the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations. When he was asked his opinion of the reputation of this eminent and outstanding citizen of his State, he replied that it was of the best.

Mr. President, I think that is all I have to say. Perhaps I should close with a Latin maxim:

Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I was called to the long-distance telephone and while I was out of the Chamber the Senator from Connecticut introduced an affidavit which I had signed some time ago with regard to a former employee. Does the Senator have the affidavit in his possession?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator introduce it in the record?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me to see the affidavit at this time?

Mr. McMAHON. Certainly.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to the letter from Mr. Foster, which was read into the record by the Senator from Connecticut. Does the Senator know when the investigation of Mr. Geiger was made?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I cannot give the date.

Mr. WHERRY. I notice that the letter is dated July 5, 1950.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask when he was investigated, because it seems to me that all that is being done here is to get a testimonial letter to answer Mr. Morris. I should like to make that plain on the record. This incident happened on June 28. A letter goes down to the ECA. It is dated July 3. On July 5 a letter comes back from the ECA and says that Mr. Geiger has been investigated. When was he investigated? Who investigated him. That does not foreclose what Mr. Morris wanted to do. He wanted to produce testimony to be heard by the committee. Now we are asked to take a testimonial letter to be a final conclusion of the matter on this man, when the minority counsel asked that a hearing be held so that testimony could be presented. Certainly the distinguished prosecutor, the Senator from Connecticut, who is one of the most able prosecutors who has ever served in Washington, would not consider that to be the proper way to handle an investigation of a man who is being charged with what he is being charged. I want that to be perfectly clear in the record. To me it is another indication of how the investigations

were made of the men whose names were brought to the attention of the committee. To my mind, that is a whitewash.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut yielded for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes. I cannot help but be somewhat—I was going to say amused—interested by the vehement reaction of the Senator from Nebraska. I shall call the Senator's remarks to the attention of Mr. Paul Hoffman and Mr. Foster. I shall do that on my private initiative. The committee is discharged. However, I shall call their attention to their clearance and to what the Senator from Nebraska has stated. I shall be very happy to show their response to the Senator from Nebraska. I imagine it was very disappointing when this letter showed up. It must have been very disappointing, indeed. However, we must suffer these vicissitudes sometime. I know the Senator from Nebraska will take it in good grace.

EXHIBIT 1

REPUBLIC OF FRANCE, DEPARTMENT OF SEINE,
CITY OF PARIS,

*Embassy of the United States of
America, ss:*

AFFIDAVIT FOR THE LOYALTY AND SECURITY
BOARD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE CON-
CERNING

We, Robert M. and Betty M. Carr, having been advised that a question has arisen concerning the loyalty of _____ and _____, desire to offer the following testimony in their behalf.

I, Robert Carr, was employed by the Department of State from July 2, 1934, until October 31, 1946, when I transferred from the Department to the Foreign Service of the United States, class 3. I am at present First Secretary of Embassy at Paris, France. I came to the Department with Henry Francis Grady when he became the first Chief of the Division of Trade Agreements. I was, previously, his teaching assistant at the University of California, where he was professor of international trade and dean of the College of Commerce, and where I received my Ph. D. in economics. When Dr. Grady became Assistant Secretary of State in 1939, I served as his assistant. I also served under him in New Delhi, India, where he was American Ambassador, 1947-48. Other immediate superiors under whom I have worked are John G. Winant (now deceased), formerly American Ambassador to London; Dean Acheson, formerly Assistant Secretary of State; and Harry C. Hawkins, formerly Director of the Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State.

I, Betty Carr, was married to my husband when he was a teaching assistant to Dr. Grady at the University of California, where I received my master's degree and completed except for a thesis, the requirements for a Ph. D. in philosophy.

We first met _____ in an air-raid shelter near Le Havre, France, in September 1939, at which time all four of us were waiting for return passage to the United States, and learned that they also lived in Washington and that _____ was employed by the United States Government. We also at that time became well acquainted with _____ father, mother, and sister.

I, Robert Carr, later supported applications for American visas made by _____ sister and mother and helped during wartime to find passage to the United States for his sister. His father died at the time of the German invasion of Paris. His mother came to the United States after the war and I had the

opportunity then to renew my acquaintance with her.

When _____ went to serve in the United States Army, I, Betty Carr, used my good offices in helping _____ to obtain a position with the American Council of Learned Societies in order that she might supplement the income allotted her from her husband's pay.

When the war was over and _____ was about to be discharged, I, Robert Carr, recommended him for the position in the Department of State which he now holds. In doing this I felt that I was doing the Department, as well as _____, a useful service, not only because I considered _____ a person with unusual intellectual attainments and emotional and moral stability, but also because I knew that he was deeply grateful to America for the opportunities and security which it offered him and that he would serve the Government of his adopted country with unusual devotion.

In the 9 years that we have known the _____, we have seen them on an average of once a week, except for the period during which _____ was in the Army, and have counted them among our most intimate friends. We have dined together in each other's homes, we have gone on family picnics, we have read the same books, enjoyed together the same music, the same paintings, and the same plays. We were interested in the same ideas. Our economic and social philosophies were similar.

Since _____ was Russian-born, we were especially interested in his views regarding Soviet developments and would have quickly detected any Communist sympathies, if he had any, no matter how cleverly they might have been concealed, for in a long, intimate relationship there are many unguarded moments when, in words, or gestures, or facial expressions, the deepest thoughts and feelings of friends are revealed. We have heard from him, and his parents, about his early childhood in Russia, particularly during the revolution when his family were refugees. They had nothing in common with revolutionists. In analyzing Soviet developments, _____ has, however, been clear-headed and objective. His views on the Soviet Union have not been prejudiced by emotional considerations arising from the fact that he was denied the heritage of a native homeland. His intellectual discipline was of too high a standard to have permitted it. He has regarded Soviet developments in the light of basic social forces and world trends.

We discussed at great length the significance of Russia's turn against Germany and her alignment with the democracies. His view, which, if publicly expressed at the time, would have constituted a serious indiscretion, was that the Second World War had come to be, not at all a conflict between two ideologies or ways of life, but, rather, a conflict between Germany and Russia for leadership of a totalitarian movement (fascism versus communism), leaving the question of totalitarianism versus democracy to be fought out later between the United States and Russia. He recognized, however, that our choice was to face the prospect of a second bout, against Russia, or run the risk of losing the first bout against Germany, and was accordingly reconciled to our alliance with the Soviet Union. The point is that _____ and his wife, who shared his views, were privately not sympathetic toward Russia at the time when expressions of pro-Soviet sympathies were popular.

The _____ were not without a sense of humor, however, regarding the Communist experiment in Russia. We recall in particular a book which they lent us, written by two Russians, with the title of "The Little Golden Calif," the amusing situations in which were based on the corruption and incredible stupidity of Soviet officials and administrators. It was a source of delight to _____ that the

book, written in the early twenties by approved Communist authors, achieved such popularity in the Soviet Union that the Government, after discovering its subtle satire on the Soviet regime, was unable to effect its suppression.

It is also recalled that among other books which the _____ lent us was a novel of outstanding merit, regarding Soviet Russia, Darkness at Noon, by Koestler, which is the most convincing and devastating commentary on the Communist regime which we have read. It is devastating for the reason that although the author, like _____, is able to present with tolerance and understanding the social grievances which have fostered the rise of communism, he, like _____, is quick to point out with equal objectivity the logical consequences of the Communist philosophy and course of action: namely, the enslavement of the individual, or, if he resists, his extermination.

It is perhaps conceivable that unsophisticated persons, impressed only by emotional manifestations, might have, through ignorance, mistaken intellectual objectivity toward Russia as a symptom of Communist sympathy. It is not conceivable, however, that anyone capable of a rational approach to social problems and their solutions could interpret _____ views regarding Russia as anything but deeply and emphatically opposed to communism and Communists' activities.

We have known _____ as a wife and mother, extremely devoted to her husband and children, and as a highly intelligent person interested chiefly in the arts, rather than in political, social, or economic matters. We have observed that in regard to such matters she shares her husband's views. It would be difficult to believe that, in view of the exceptionally close and harmonious relations between her and her husband, she could hold political views differing substantially from those of her husband.

I, Betty Carr, have discussed with _____, among other subjects of usual interest to women, problems of child training and care and know that she strongly opposes regimentation and tries to encourage in her children the spirit of individualism. She, as well as her husband, believes strongly in the institution of the family and in the institution of private property on which it is in a large part based.

On the basis of our long and intimate relationship with _____, we are convinced that they are not Communists, that they are not in sympathy with Communist philosophy, objectives, or activities, and that they can be completely trusted as loyal Americans, faithful and devoted to the political, economic, and social principles embodied in the constitution of the United States. In fact, we cannot conceive on what basis their loyalty might be questioned, and are deeply distressed that such a statement as this should be necessary.

ROBERT M. CARR.
BETTY M. CARR.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
18th day of October 1948.

[SEAL] LEONARD R. MOREY,
Vice Consul of the United States
of America at Paris, France.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT,
Hanover, N. H.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
County of Grafton, ss:

AFFIDAVIT

I, Arthur M. Wilson, being duly sworn, depose and say:

In 1939 a friend of mine, a former fellow student in the Harvard graduate school, assured me that I would greatly enjoy making the acquaintance of one _____ who was in France that summer and whom my

friend had met in France the preceding year. The — and we made an appointment, but the outbreak of war prevented our meeting as planned. By great coincidence we found ourselves on the same boat returning to New York, the steamship *Roosevelt*, which sailed from Pouillac, France, in late September 1939.

The rest of that year I continued to be on leave of absence from Dartmouth College, and from late December of 1939 to late March of 1940 my wife and I did research in the Library of Congress. During that time we frequently saw the — and we have been in touch with them off and on ever since. I do not recall that we saw each other face to face between March 1940 and 1943. I certainly saw him once in 1943, when he was about to be inducted and was interviewing people in OSS in the hope of being assigned for service there, and we saw them now and again in 1944 and 1945, during which time he was assigned to OSS and was living in Greenbelt. The last time I saw him was when we had lunch together at the State Department just after New Year's 10 months ago.

My personal knowledge of — and his wife makes me think it extremely unlikely that either of them ever was or is now a member of the Communist Party or a Communist sympathizer. The first days I ever knew —, when in 1939 we were on the boat returning to the United States, I remember that he expressed repugnance at the idea that the U. S. S. R. had invaded Poland. A few months later I was present at a heated argument in which the — defended Finland and criticized the U. S. S. R. for its attack on Finland. Also during that winter of 1939-1940 I was present at a dinner party with the — during which our host set forth ideas which certainly seemed to me to be antidemocratic in tendency and sympathetic to the Fuhrer-Prinzip. I remember that — vigorously attacked these views, and his defense of democracy, by the way, was framed in concepts that were Jeffersonian, not Marxist. These were the months of the so-called phony war. I never once heard — or his wife defend the Nazi-Soviet pact, or suggest that the war was an imperialistic war or that it was not our war, or any other of the favorite contentions of Communists or Communist sympathizers at that time.

I knew the — most intimately in these months of 1940, but nevertheless we have been in touch with them by letter and by occasional visits since, and I have never detected in them any change or trend in their point of view. That point of view is characterized by (1) a deep and well grounded appreciation of the meaning and value of western European and American culture; (2) an abhorrence of totalitarian or police state methods wherever they are to be found; (3) a mode of thought which uses words and concepts which are Jeffersonian-democratic, not Marxian. I have always found — to argue any matter, whether political, literary, or aesthetic, on its merits and not according to some preconceived, programmatic line of thought. Moreover, he does not think in terms of the class struggle, or dialectical materialism, or with any other of the familiar Marxian crutches. His whole cast of mind is liberal in the western sense, as well as New Deal in the American sense, and it is completely anti-Marxian or non-Marxian. Moreover, I have never detected in either of the — anything that would suggest that they were being shifty or deceitful or evasive, or were trying to conceal their real opinions. I know the working of — mind better than that of his wife, but my belief is that the foregoing characterizes the one as well as the other.

In short, I have never noticed anything about either of the — which would raise the slightest suspicion in my mind as to

their complete loyalty to this country. — is a man who is intelligent, competent, conscientious, and discreet. I might point out, for instance, that when we saw each other now and again while both of us were with OSS, he acted in a completely security-conscious manner toward me, as I did toward him.

Of myself, let me say that I was born at Rural, Rock Island County, Ill., on July 29, 1902, and have lived all my life in this country except for 3 years (1924-1927) when I was a student at the University of Oxford, and except for a few months in 1939, when I was in France on a Guggenheim Fellowship. I have been at Dartmouth College since 1933, my present title and rank being professor of biography and government. From January 3, 1943 to September 1, 1945, I was with OSS at Washington, assigned first to the Current Intelligence Staff of the research and analysis branch, then to the foreign nationalities branch, and finally to the OSS history project.

ARTHUR M. WILSON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of October 1948.

[SEAL]

DONALD L. BARR,

Notary Public.

My commission expires January 21, 1949.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
County of Grafton, ss:

AFFIDAVIT

I, Julia Mary (Tolford) Wilson, being duly sworn, depose and say:

I first knew — in September 1939 when my husband, Prof. Arthur M. Wilson, of Dartmouth College, and I were returning from Europe on the same boat as were the —. I saw her next, and several times, during the period from late December of 1939 to late March of 1940 when Mr. Wilson and I were resident in Washington while he was doing research in the Library of Congress. From then until 1943, I did not see her, and what correspondence passed between the families was extremely casual as far as my relation with her was concerned. In January of 1943, my husband returned to Washington to work with OSS, and sometime during that year we saw the — once when they came through Washington. After — himself was transferred to OSS, we saw the — several times. I have seen neither since I left Washington in September of 1945.

While I have been very friendly with — at such times as our paths have crossed, it cannot be said that we have ever been intimate friends. However, when one is with the — the conversation is confined almost exclusively to ideas and to intellectual subjects, so that one quickly gets to know the cast of their minds. I soon learned, therefore, that — was an ardent New Dealer, with tastes for the most advanced in art and music. Though I did not completely share her enthusiasm on these subjects, the four of us were congenial enough to enjoy an occasional evening together. The talk was always what is commonly called stimulating, and that was largely because neither of the — is hesitant to express an opinion on any topic under discussion.

I have no hesitation in saying that —, in spite of this willingness to let her views be known, never said anything that would lead me even to suspect that she might be or ever had been a member of the Communist Party. As for her sympathies, I cannot remember that she ever disagreed with her husband on subjects pertinent to this affidavit. For his views, I would refer you to the statement of my husband about —.

Returning, as Mr. Wilson and I did, from Europe in late September of 1939, we were thrown with many voluntary but unappreciative repatriates. This experience made me very sensitive to and hostile toward those

who criticized or were unsympathetic to democracy. In fact, I probably might have been described as having become militantly American. I believe, therefore, that I would have been very likely to detect any anti-American attitude in —, and am the more convinced that her views were sympathetic to mine because I still retain very vivid impressions of others whom I met at that period and who were not enthusiastic believers in democracy.

As for her trustworthiness, I do not remember that — ever said anything which indicated that she might be indiscreet and inadvertently reveal a military secret if she ever knew one. I say this with the more confidence because I myself was very conscious of the problem of security, not only because of my husband's connection with OSS but because I did a good deal of volunteer work at the United Nations Service Center at the Union Station Plaza, where the importance of guarding one's speech was constantly being impressed upon one.

I was born in this country (at Boyd, Chipewewa County, Wis.) of native-born parents.

JULIA MARY (TOLFORD) WILSON.

HANOVER, N. H.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of October 1948.

[SEAL]

DONALD L. BARR,

Notary Public.

My commission expires January 21, 1949.

To Whom It May Concern:

I, Gerhard E. Kadisch, residing at 106 Cook Street, Bennettsville, S. C., and Valley Road, Wachtung, N. J., hereby declare that I am a naturalized citizen of the United States of America. I was born in Denmark (Copenhagen). I am at present general manager of Boro Wood Products Co., Inc., Bennettsville, S. C.

I first met — in May 1932, in Berlin, Germany, in my capacity as general manager of the Goerz Division of Zeiss Ikon A. G., Berlin-Zehlendorf. — was a nephew of Prof. Emmanuel Goldberg who was a well-known scientist and managing director of the Zeiss Ikon A. G. in Dresden, Germany. — was then employed in the advertising department.

In addition to periodic contacts with him in the course of business, I got to know him and his family socially, as he was a frequent guest at a small social club for the promotion and study of the English language and literature at which I was an occasional guest speaker. At that time I found Mr. — to be a very refined, well-educated, young man, remarkably well versed in literature and art and generally of high intellectual caliber.

I occasionally visited his father's home. The family lived in comfortable circumstances but I understood that they were at one time wealthy Russian industrialists and that the family had lost most of their possessions during the Russian revolution. Mr. —, Sr. described to me some of the adventurous episodes of his family's life in Russia and the impression that I got at the time of the family's political leanings was certainly not that of any sympathy with communism. On the contrary, the atmosphere was typical of that found in most Russian immigrant families at that time, namely, that of distinct hostility toward the Bolsheviks.

In 1933, after Hitler's coming to power, a particularly radical situation developed in the Zeiss Ikon concern. — uncle, the managing director of the company, was subjected to brutal Nazi persecution and — himself as the nephew of the non-Aryan company head was forced to resign and left the company.

I was instrumental in helping him get a job temporarily with the Zeiss subsidiary in Paris, France, and I visited him there in the summer of 1934 in the course of a business trip to that country. — family had

in the meantime left Germany and settled down in France. During my stay there in 1934 I spent several evenings with _____ and his family. The atmosphere was distinctly a nonpolitical one, and neither then nor at any subsequent time have I ever noticed any pronounced political interest on the part of _____ other than those of the average well-educated man.

Early in 1934 I entered the employ of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co., Stamford, Conn., and took over the management of their Czechoslovakian company. In 1935 _____ wrote me from Paris that he had decided that there was no future for him in Europe and that he was going to emigrate to the United States of America where he had an uncle. I invited him to visit me in Czechoslovakia before he went and in the summer of 1935 he stayed a few days with me in Opava as my guest. I gave him a letter of introduction to the lately deceased president of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co., Mr. W. Gibson Carey, and he was employed there for some time but left to study economics.

I came to the United States of America in January 1939 and I met _____ and his wife, _____, on several occasions during my business trips to Washington, Chicago, New York, and they also visited me at my home in Plainfield, N. J., in the period from 1939 to about 1944 during which period I was employed as general manager of General Ceramics Co., Metuchen and Keasbey, N. J. In renewing my acquaintance with _____ I found that both he and his wife were well read and intellectually well developed people with a wide range of interests. Our conversations covered numerous subjects in the fields of general philosophy, literature, art, foreign affairs, American history, etc. As a result of the very engrossing conversations I am sure that I would have detected any sign of communistic ideology on either _____ part if he or she had so expressed themselves and such was definitely not the case. I found them both to be marked individualists and antagonistic to totalitarian principles and regimes. This applied both to their attitude to the totalitarian nations with which we were at war and to their attitude to the Russian attack on Finland and the carving up of Poland and swallowing up of the Baltic states prior to the actual outbreak of war.

In the last few years, my work has left me little time for social activities and solely for this reason my contacts with the _____ have been limited to an occasional exchange of greetings, Christmas cards, etc. I feel however, and I have no hesitation in so stating, that any charge that _____ was a member of or even a sympathizer with the Communist Party in Europe is entirely unfounded, judging from my personal observations of his attitude and interests at the time that I knew him there. As for his activities in the United States of America I again repeat that in my numerous contacts with him in the time from 1939 to 1944 or '45 I have at no time observed any sympathy with the Communists or any other foreign group nor have I observed any sign or expression of disloyalty to the United States of America. On the contrary, I always regarded him as being an enthusiastic believer in the democratic principle and American way of life and I particularly remember his avid reading of all available literature on Lincoln, of whom he was a great admirer. Both he and his wife always impressed me as being people of high moral character and idealism and I felt that his repeated statements of his thankfulness for being able to live in the United States really reflected the sincerity of their feelings in this respect. Although it would at this time be personally inconvenient to me to travel to Washington, I am prepared if necessary to do so in order to appear as a witness at the Loyalty Board

hearing as I am convinced from all my observations and previous contacts with them that both _____ are loyal American citizens.

GERHARD E. KADISCH.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
County of Marlboro:

Personally appeared before me G. E. Kadisch, who, being first duly sworn, says that the foregoing statement is true of his own knowledge.

GERHARD E. KADISCH.

Sworn to before me this October 15, 1948.

[SEAL] JULIET LEEF,
Notary Public for South Carolina.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Volusia, ss:

Paul E. Raymond first being duly sworn, on oath deposes and states that:

1. He is a citizen of and a practicing attorney at law in Daytona Beach, Volusia County, Fla., and is president of the Daytona Beach Chamber of Commerce, and chairman of the Halifax District and vice president of the Central Florida Council, Boy Scouts of America.

2. Affiant was personally acquainted with _____ from October 1937, to June 1938, and was in daily association with him. _____ was research assistant of the affiant who was preparing as editor a volume on parole for the United States Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures. At that time affiant was professor of law in John B. Stetson University, DeLand, Fla., before he became Dean of the School of Law from 1938 to 1941.

3. During the 9 months association between affiant and _____, affiant had frequent occasion to discuss with _____ various national and international questions involving social, economic, and political policy. In all of the many conversations regarding such matters the affiant never heard _____ express any word of sympathy toward communism or any other philosophy inconsistent with the American ideals. The impression that the affiant gained of _____ after this association was that _____ was a steadfast opponent of communism and the various totalitarian philosophies, and was a loyal adherent to the prevailing American interpretation of democratic ideals.

4. During this association between the affiant and _____, the affiant was vice president of the DeLand, Fla., Chamber of Commerce and was active in several other civic organizations. As such he induced _____ to speak on international questions for the junior chamber of commerce, the Stetson University student body, and other civic organizations. At one time he arranged for a radio broadcast of _____ speech. At that time the most imminent threat to the peace of the world appeared to be from Nazi and Fascist countries, and most of _____ comments related to this fact. His comments, however, indicated that he was strongly opposed to any form of totalitarianism and aggression, whether Fascist or Communist, and affiant believes that no one could have heard him without concluding that he was opposed to nazism, fascism, and communism alike. Several listeners commented to the affiant after said speeches that _____ had a better understanding and appreciation of American ideals than most native-born Americans.

5. Affiant was assistant attorney general of Florida from 1941 to 1942, and thereafter was an officer in the United States Navy on active duty for 40 months. Affiant has no sympathy whatever with any un-American philosophy and is extraordinarily sensitive to any expression sympathetic to

any foreign philosophy. Affiant strongly believes that persons sympathetic to activities subversive of American ideals should not be tolerated in governmental positions, but affiant is at a loss to understand how an accusation on this score could be leveled at a man who manifested the ideals and beliefs that _____ did during his 9 months association with the affiant.

6. Affiant regrets that because of the pressure of his business he is unable to make the trip to Washington to testify in _____ behalf, but he will do so in the event that it is required.

PAUL E. RAYMOND.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 23d day of October A. D. 1948.

[SEAL] FRANCES C. TAYLOR,
Notary Public, State of Florida at Large.

My commission expires February 22, 1950.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
October 26, 1948.

The LOYALTY SECURITY BOARD,
Department of State,
New State Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have just received a telephone call from Mr. Paul E. Raymond, an attorney of Daytona Beach, Fla., formerly dean of the John B. Stetson Law School of Florida, in regard to Mr. _____. Mr. Raymond informs me that Mr. _____, an employee of the State Department, is being investigated by the Loyalty Security Board on charges that he is or has been a Communist.

Mr. Raymond was on my staff in the United States Department of Justice from 1936 to 1938, when I was Director of the Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures. He served as director and editor of that phase of the study which dealt with the subject of parole. One of Mr. Raymond's assistants on the editorial staff was Mr. _____, who had been appointed as a sociologist to assist the editorial board with some of the sociological problems involved in parole procedure.

As director and editor in chief of the entire survey, I came to know Mr. _____ in connection with his work on our staff. On the basis of his professional work for the Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures during the period of time indicated above, he gave no indication at all that he held even friendly feelings toward the Communistic ideology. In fact, it would be a great surprise to me as well as a keen disappointment if, since leaving his work in the Department of Justice, Mr. _____ had developed even the slightest sympathy for the Communist philosophy.

Of course, I did not know Mr. _____ intimately outside of his office, but my recollection of him is that he was always a rather emphatic opponent of any totalitarian view, be it of fascism, nazism, or communism. As I recall, Mr. _____ came to the United States from Poland, but I am not certain about that. However, I do recall distinctly that he was very critical in those days of the totalitarian philosophy which was sweeping Europe in Germany and Italy as well as in Russia.

Nevertheless, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I have had no contacts with Mr. _____ whatsoever since 1938, and I am in no position to pass any reliable judgment whatsoever upon his political, social, economic, or religious philosophy since he served on the Department of Justice staff at the same time I was there. Also, I wish to make perfectly clear that if there is any evidence against Mr. _____ which establishes the fact that he is a Communist or a fellow traveler, then I am very much of the opinion that he and all others of like point of view

should be discharged from holding any position in our Federal Government.

However, in fairness to Mr. —, for whatever value it may prove to be worth in light of any evidence which has been developed subsequent to his service with the Department of Justice, I think it is only right to give you my impression that when he was associated on Mr. Raymond's editorial staff in connection with the parole phase of our study, Mr. — gave no indication that he held any sympathy whatsoever for any form of totalitarianism, including communism.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

AFFIDAVIT

I, the undersigned, Eugene W. Posnjak, residing at 1076 Tornoe Road, Santa Barbara, Calif., do solemnly swear and affirm that:

I have recently retired from the Geophysical Laboratory of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, where I held the position of research chemist continuously since 1913. During most of this time I was residing at 3400 Rodman Street NW., Washington, D. C. I was born in Moscow, Russia, in 1888 and was educated there and at the University of Leipzig, Germany, where I received the Ph. D. degree in chemistry in 1912. I came to this country in 1912 and became a citizen of the United States in 1921.

I have known my nephew —, of 5404 Thirty-ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., since he was about 10 years old and have followed his development closely, seeing him on trips I made to Germany in 1921, 1923, 1929, and 1932 when I visited his parents who were living in Germany, as were also my parents. They had all been forced to flee Russia as a result of the Communist revolution. — father, the late — was my brother. He had been a well-to-do industrialist in Moscow before the revolution and owned several factories in that city, which were expropriated by the Soviet regime. My nephew was educated in Germany and was attending the University of Berlin in 1933 when the coming to power to Hitler made it advisable to leave Germany, and he went to live and work in Paris, France.

I spent several months on each of my trips to Europe and while there saw — a great deal. We became close friends and had many intimate conversations, occasionally discussing also politics. I had never heard him to express Communist views or even any opinions that might be considered radical. In fact, I had the impression that he was not greatly interested in politics, being more concerned with cultural subjects, such as literature, theater, art, etc. I am certain that he did not engage in any radical or subversive activities when he was in college in Berlin or later when he went to Paris and I am also sure that he never belonged to any Communist or other subversive organizations in Europe. I think his family background makes this quite understandable.

In August 1935, at my suggestion (which I first made in 1933 while he was still in Berlin) and with my assistance, — obtained the United States immigration visa and came to this country. For about 6 months, until early January 1936 — lived with me and my family at my residence at 3400 Rodman Street NW. I had an opportunity to observe him closely. I never heard him express views sympathetic to communism and he certainly never took part in any political activities whatsoever. After — got a job with a Washington patent attorney (as translator), he went to live by himself, but he came to my house frequently and my opinion of him did not change.

I met — wife, —, before they were married in 1938, and I saw them both frequently after their marriage at my home and at theirs. — impressed me as a quiet, re-

liable, cultured person, devoted to her husband and his career. She seems to do her own thinking but I have never observed anything subversive and in the least fanatical about her. Both — were greatly interested in such cultural matters as theater, literature, art, music, and also gave much of their free time to their hobby of water-color painting. Since the birth of their two sons when — was in the Army, they have been preoccupied with their children's upbringing to the exclusion of practically all other interests. I am completely confident that neither of them engaged in any subversive or radical activities of any kind.

I can recall that in some of our conversations — both expressed profound disgust for such manifestations of Soviet foreign policy as the Nazi-Soviet pact in August 1939, the Soviet invasion of Finland, or more recently the Soviet aggressions in Iran, Greece, and other small nations. They were strongly opposed to Nazi and Fascist aggressions in Ethiopia, Austria, and Spain but they seem to be fully as much opposed to the Soviet aggressions. They both impressed me as being utterly hostile to totalitarian states and profoundly attached to the democratic institutions and traditions of America.

I have no hesitation in stating that in my opinion both — are completely loyal to the United States and devoted to the principles on which this country is founded. I am convinced that they are both wholeheartedly patriotic Americans.

EUGENE W. POSNJAK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 16th day of October 1948.

[SEAL]

E. J. MEGAS,

Notary Public in and for the County of Santa Barbara, State of California.

My commission expires March 18, 1952.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of New York, ss:

Lazar I. Estrin, 65 Central Park West, New York, N. Y., being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am a native of Russia; have immigrated into the United States in 1916; naturalized in 1922.

I have been on the staff of the Irving Trust Co. and its predecessor banks continuously since 1917 and have been a vice president of the institution since 1930 in its foreign department.

I have been informed of an investigation of the loyalty of Mr. —, of 5404 Thirty-ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., who is employed in the State Department as an economist.

I am familiar with Mr. — background over a long period of years, going back to his grandfather, Mr. Solomon Koppleman, in Russia, who was a prosperous and conservative merchant, religious and devoted to philanthropy.

I met Mr. — father and mother repeatedly during my travels in Europe where they were refugees from the Soviet regime in Russia. The family fortune having been lost as a result of the Communist revolution, the entire household was permeated with a strong anti-Communist feeling.

I met — when he first arrived in this country as a very young man and he impressed me most favorably as to his character and up-bringing. I had many personal contacts with him during the first few years of his stay here and am convinced of his entire loyalty to this country and its institutions and his genuine gratitude for the opportunities it has given him. It is my firm conviction that he is not a Communist or a Communist sympathizer or otherwise in any way disloyal to this country.

LAZAR I. ESTRIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a notary public, in and for said county, this 14th day of October 1948.

GEORGE F. MAUTER,
Notary Public, State of New York.

COMMUNITY HALL,

Gladwyne, Pa., October 13, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

I was indeed astonished to learn that a charge of Communist leanings had been brought against —.

I have known — since 1930, at which time I was appointed head of social service work in Gladwyne. (At the present time I am also executive secretary of the Gladwyne Civic Association, and president of the Gladwyne fire company.) As I live across the street from the Aranson home I feel I knew the family very well indeed. — was always ambitious, and eager to familiarize herself with the cultures—music, literature, and art.

We have had many talks on national and international affairs, both before and after her marriage with —. She and — seldom came home on a visit that they did not come across the street to call on us, since we all enjoyed the same things. I have never heard either say anything that was un-American, or that could be construed as the least subversive.

I have always felt that I could trust both in every way, and I still have the same feeling toward them.

I can only regret that owing to a recent serious heart attack it is impossible for me at this time to travel to Washington to testify on their behalf. My condition also prevents Mrs. Bell from leaving home for any appreciable length of time, also.

STUART BELL.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 15th day of October 1948.

WALTER B. LOWNES, Jr.,

Notary Public.

My commission expires end next session of Senate.

GLADWYNE FREE LIBRARY,

Gladwyne, Pa., October 13, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

It was with profound shock that I learned recently that — were looked upon as Communists.

I have known — since she was a school girl. My husband and I came to Gladwyne in the fall of 1930, as he had been appointed head of the social service work in that village. The home of the — family was across the street from the Community House, where we lived, and we saw a great deal of them. They were a family, quiet, hard working, and respected in the community. I might add that I have never known a more generous and kindly person than —. She was constantly spending herself in the service of those in trouble. As a family they were well-read, vitally interested in current events, and with a keen love of the arts, especially music. In all the years we knew them, when affairs, both national and international, were freely discussed between us, I have never heard a subversive statement from any one of them.

To them all, America was a land of beauty and integrity, and on graduating from high school — was eager to work in Washington—to her a city of romance and of promise. I might add that while waiting to take her civil-service examination she freely offered her services as pianist to the playground commission in Philadelphia, and through her associations there came into close contact with a group of music lovers, which led to an association with the Philadelphia Orchestra and other music groups. Until she left Gladwyne she was also a member of the Girls' Friendly Society branch in that village, of which I was leader, and was very active in all their interests—music,

dances, athletics, and social-service work. I can only reiterate that she was a girl with an exceptionally fine mind, a deep love of all things cultural, and an intelligent interest in national and international affairs.

On her visits home, after she was employed in Washington, she invariably called on us, and our conversations were often on world affairs. I can recall her distress and horror as conditions grew blacker in Europe. After her marriage she and her husband, —, continued to call on us during their visits back to Gladwyne. Naturally by that time (from 1938 on) the topic of German, and later, Russian aggression, formed a large part of our conversation, but at no time did either express anything but the greatest repugnance for National Socialist and Communist ideologies. We were glad to change the subject back to our old gay debates on music and books.

I feel strongly that there has been serious misunderstanding somewhere, because after having known — 18 years, and — 10, I am still convinced that there are no more sincere and loyal American citizens in this country than they.

MAUD BUTLER BELL.
(Mrs. Stuart Bell).

Sworn and subscribed before me this 15th day of October.

WALTER B. LOWENS, Notary Public.
My commission expires end next session of Senate.

OCTOBER 14, 1948.

REPUBLIC OF FRANCE, DEPARTMENT OF SEINE,
CITY OF PARIS,
Embassy of the United States of America,
ss:

LOYALTY AND SECURITY BOARD,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington 25, D. C.

Subject: Loyalty of —.

Having been informed that in the course of the investigation of — under the employee loyalty program the allegation has been made that he is a Communist or Communist sympathizer, and that a hearing of his case has been set for October 26, 1948, I welcome this opportunity to place the following information before the Board.

I met Mr. — for the first time early in 1941, through mutual friends, Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. Carr (Mr. Carr is a foreign service officer, presently assigned to the American Embassy, Paris, France). Since that time I have, on a number of occasions, attended social functions or small informal gatherings where he was present. I have nothing but the most pleasant recollections of his conduct in these situations. Nothing he said ever gave me the slightest impression that he was a Communist sympathizer, much less a Communist. On the contrary, I have from the beginning had the very definite impression that he had no intellectual or political leanings toward communism. Never in the years I have known him have I ever heard anyone question his complete loyalty to the United States.

In regard to my professional contacts with Mr. —, the longest period of close association with him was in 1946, when he was my assistant for several weeks in New York, during the second part of the first session of the General Assembly. As executive officer of the United States delegation for committee 2, I was responsible for helping Alternate Delegates Adlai E. Stevenson and HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS with their work on this committee. As might be expected, the views of the U. S. S. R. and satellites concerning items on the agenda frequently were opposed to those of the United States delegation. Never during the course of his work with me in the development of arguments in favor of the United States position and against those of the U. S. S. R. did I sense the slightest hint of disagreement with the United States position. His work was uni-

formly excellent and constructive; he was most cooperative; and I had complete confidence in his loyalty.

These earlier favorable impressions were further confirmed recently, shortly before my departure for Paris as executive officer for committee 2 of the General Assembly, third regular session. At my suggestion, Mr. — prepared a confidential paper (US (F)/A/C.2/4, September 28, 1948) entitled "Criticism of the International Bank," for possible use here in Paris in dealing with an anticipated repetition of attacks on the Bank by the U. S. S. R. and satellites. This paper, which was widely cleared in the Department, is an example of the competent work done by Mr. —. It is, in my view, entirely in accord with United States policy, and should prove valuable to the United States delegation if the occasion arises. (The Board should be able to obtain a copy of this paper from UNE.) Before final clearance of the paper, Mr. — showed me the original and we discussed it together at some length. This conversation strengthened my earlier impressions of his competence and trustworthiness.

To sum up, from my personal and professional association with — I am convinced that he is completely loyal to the United States.

WILLIAM A. FOWLER,
Foreign Service Officer, Class III.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of October 1948.

LEONARD R. MOREY,
Vice Consul of the United States of America.

AFFIDAVIT

REPUBLIC OF FRANCE, DEPARTMENT OF SEINE,
CITY OF PARIS,
Embassy of the United States of America, ss:

1. — has been well known to me, Hubert F. Havlik, since August 1946. When I became Chief of the Division of Investment and Economic Development in the Department of State, Mr. — was a member of the staff of that Division at that time. While I was Chief of that Division, until September 5, 1948, he worked under my general direction and often under my specific guidance, in connection with matters I was handling personally. Many memoranda which he prepared were specifically reviewed and approved by me, and I frequently discussed with him at length matters which fell within the scope of his assignment.

2. Mr. — was specifically responsible for the subject matter of the Division's responsibility relating to the central and eastern European area (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and the U. S. S. R.). Important matters with which Mr. — dealt were the following:

(a) Financial and development needs of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland, and requests for Export-Import Bank or International Bank loans by these countries, as well as the application of loans granted by the Export-Import Bank to some of these countries.

(b) Problems of compensation for property of United States nationals nationalized by Czechoslovakia and Poland. (This work was, after several months, transferred to another Division of the Department.)

(c) The economic development aspects of trade between the eastern and western European countries, as well as of policies regarding the control of exports from the United States to countries of eastern Europe.

3. Because of his capacity for analysis and drafting, and knowledge of the work of the Division, Mr. — also was designated by the Division to act as advisor on economic development to United States delegation to

at least one meeting of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, as well as meetings of some of the subgroups of ECOSOC. He also assisted in drafting various "position papers" for the guidance of delegation members.

4. Work on all these problems involved a large degree of skill and analysis of the economic aspects of problems within the boundaries of the general policies established by the Department of State. In my experience, Mr. — followed instructions with respect to the scope and objectives of his assignments with conscientious regard for the interests of the United States Government. Draft recommendations which he formulated or assisted in formulating were usually discussed among representatives of other interested Divisions of the State Department and revised in accordance with decisions reached in the course of these discussions. I have never felt at any time that his analyses and recommendations were biased in favor of the interests of the U. S. S. R. and its satellites, or in favor of communism, or that they were taken with a view to action against the interests of the United States Government. While there were often differences of opinion among departmental personnel as to policy on matters which Mr. — was called upon to deal with, my conviction, based on my personal knowledge of his work, is that Mr. — is not sympathetic with communistic doctrine, methods, or objectives.

5. According to my observation, Mr. — held scrupulously to both the spirit and the letter of requirements for security made necessary by his position in the Department. I do not have nor ever have had any reservations with respect to his loyalty to the United States Government nor have I ever heard any reservations expressed by any person.

6. At present I am Chief of the Payments Section in the Office of the Special Representative, Economic Cooperation Administration, Paris, France. From 1942 to 1944, I was an economist and an official in the War Production Board; from 1944 to 1945, I was in the Foreign Economic Administration holding the position of Deputy Assistant Administrator for economic programs at the time of its termination. From December 1945 to August 1946, I was Chief of the Division of Lend-Lease in surplus property policies in the Department of State; from 1946 to 1948, I was Chief of the Division of Investment and Economic Development, and on several occasions Acting Director of the Office of Financial and Development Policy.

HUBERT F. HAVLIK.

PARIS, FRANCE, October 19, 1948.

Then personally appeared the above named Hubert F. Havlik and made oath the foregoing statements by him subscribed are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

[SEAL] LEONARD R. MOREY,
Vice Consul of the United States of America.

1. I am making this affidavit at the request of Mr. —, for presentation to the Loyalty and Security Board of the Department of State.

2. I was employed by the Department of State from July 1944 to September 1946. From approximately December 1945 until my resignation, I was Chief of the Division of Investment and Economic Development. (It is possible that my formal appointment as Chief was not made until some weeks after I was in fact responsible for the work of the Division.) Mr. — was an officer in this Division during the entire period that I was in charge of the Division.

3. A large part of Mr. — work related to economic policy toward the countries of eastern Europe. In view of the small number

of men in the Division, I had close contact with Mr. —, and I found him thoroughly competent, conscientious, and reliable. His actions and his attitudes all indicated a sincere devotion to the best interests of the United States, and nothing that he said or did in my association with him could possibly be regarded as disloyal, or as suggesting in any way an association with the Communist Party. Nothing in my contacts with Mr. — would lead me to question his integrity, or his observance of the strict security standards that would be expected of an officer of the Department of State.

4. I do not know what Mr. — did outside of office hours, or with whom he associated, but there was nothing in his attitude, conversation, or behavior that raised the slightest suspicion in my mind as to his loyalty, or that made me consider him in any different light than I would consider any officer of the Department.

5. Around the spring of 1946, after Mr. — had attended several meetings in the Department on eastern European problems, reports came to me indirectly that an officer—or perhaps more than one officer—in the Department had made unfavorable comments about Mr. —, apparently as a result of some discussion at the meetings. The remarks were of a very vague nature, and suggested that the person or persons originating them might have had a personal disagreement with Mr. —, or possibly objected on general principle to having a person born in eastern Europe working in the Department of State on Eastern European problems. I did not feel that the remarks reflected in any way on Mr. — loyalty, his integrity, or his reliability. In view of their trivial nature I paid no attention to them.

6. I resigned from the Department in September 1946 to return to Haverford College as professor of economics. I had been at Haverford since 1934, and in January 1943 had been given leave of absence to enter Government service. I resigned from Haverford College early in 1948 to join the faculty of liberal arts of Northwestern University as professor of economics, a position that I now hold. I reside at 580 Orchard Lane, Winnetka, Ill.

7. I have seen Mr. — several times since I left the Department, and nothing in these contacts has altered the high opinion I formed while in the Department of his loyalty, his integrity, and his observance of high standards of security.

FRANK WHITSON FETTER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a notary public, this 18th day of October 1948.

RUTH GATES.

My commission expires August 19, 1951.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of New York, ss:

Emilio G. Collado, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. My name is Emilio G. Collado.

2. I reside at Old Westbury Road, East Hills, Roslyn, Long Island, N. Y.

3. I am presently employed as Foreign Exchange Manager, Standard Oil Co., (Inc. in New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y.

4. In 1945 I was Deputy on Financial Affairs to Mr. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and Director of the Office of Financial and Development Policy of the Department of State, Washington, D. C. I resigned these positions in May 1946, to become United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington, D. C., retaining a consultant status with the Department of State.

5. The Division of Economic Development Policy (E. D.), now known as the Division of

Investment and Economic Development, was at that time, and continues to fall, within the jurisdiction of the Office of Financial and Development Policy.

6. Mr. — was appointed an economist in such division on October 10, 1945, and continued a member of the staff of the division when I resigned from the State Department. Mr. — was appointed at the recommendation of Mr. D. M. Phelps, then Chief of E. D., who subsequently served as a member of the United States delegation to the Paris reparations conference, and then resigned to return to the University of Michigan. Mr. — subsequently served under Mr. Frank W. Fetter, who has since returned to academic work and is now at the Northwestern University.

7. My association with Mr. — was very largely confined to the period in which we were both employed in the Department of State, and to our work together there. Our contacts were in general those of the director of an office with one of the responsible officers within his organization. I had specific association with Mr. — on a number of occasions in connection with financial and economic questions, especially relating to Czechoslovakia and Poland. He had developed the circumstances surrounding such questions and policy and action recommendations. The recommendations Mr. — made on these questions were, in my opinion, well balanced and constructive and my regard for his work and ability, based on these contacts, was very high.

8. Insofar as I am aware, Mr. — has not been connected with any organization whose purpose it is to overthrow the Government of the United States. I have no reason to believe that he is in any way disloyal to the United States. On the contrary, in the duties which he performed under my general supervision as an officer of the Department of State in making recommendations on foreign policy matters, with special reference to eastern Europe, Mr. — conducted himself as an able, effective and loyal officer of the Department.

EMILIO G. COLLADO.

Sworn to before me this 22nd day of October, 1948.

CHARLES E. HILL,

Notary Public, Rockland County.

Commission expires March 30, 1949.

AFFIDAVIT FOR INFORMATION OF LOYALTY AND SECURITY BOARD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

REPUBLIC OF CHINA, PROVINCE OF KIANGSU,
CITY OF NANKING,

Embassy of the United States of America, ss:

Before me, Bruce M. Lancaster, vice consul of the United States of America in and for the city of Nanking, China, duly commissioned and qualified, personally appeared Thomas J. Cory, who, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

My name is Thomas J. Cory and I am serving as second secretary of the American Embassy at Nanking, China. I wish to make certain statements concerning the loyalty to American institutions and the anticommunism of —.

I have known Mr. — since July 19, 1947, when we both began service as advisors to the United States Representative to the fifth session of the Economic and Social Council at Lake Success. I saw a great deal of him during the month the fifth session continued. During the subsequent year, I had two long dinners and conversations with him in his home in Washington, D. C., and one long dinner and conversation in my home in New York City. In addition, we have also had luncheons together in Washington, D. C.

Mr. — and I are both deeply interested in and have discussed at length the position of the U. S. S. R. in the world today, its

internal stresses and the present and future status of its relations with the United States. My knowledge of the U. S. S. R. is derived from 8 months of Russian language study at Cornell University, 11 months of service as second secretary of the American Embassy in Moscow, 8 months of service as American vice consul at Vladivostok, 3 months of service as an officer in the Division of Eastern European Affairs of the Department of State, and 8 months of study at the Russian Institute of Columbia University. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. — interest in the U. S. S. R. derives from his excellent mind and his broad intellectual and professional interests as well as his Russian origin. I understand that he was born in Russia of Russian parents who fled from Moscow when he was 6 years of age that is in 1947. He came to the United States from France in about 1936, is now a naturalized American citizen after serving in the United States Army during the war and is married to an American girl from Philadelphia whom I know and respect as an intelligent, well-educated person thoroughly loyal to American institutions. It is in the light of our respective backgrounds that I wish to state categorically that during many long conversations about the U. S. S. R. I have never known Mr. — to express a thought or give any indication suggesting that he was at any time or in any way sympathetic to Communist aims and methods or hostile to American society and policies. On the contrary, I concluded from my knowledge of his past history, from the manner in which he discharged his duties at the fifth session of the Economic and Social Council and from my observations of his personal relationships with the other foreign and American advisors to that fifth session that Mr. — is a competent and balanced observer of Soviet Russia, an honorable man and a loyal American.

And further deponent saith not.

THOMAS J. CORY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of October 1948.

[SEAL]

BRUCE M. LANCASTER,

Vice Consul of the United States of America.

CITY OF PARIS,

Republic of France.

John C. Ross being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am Deputy to the United States Representative to the United Nations having an office at 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. I am a resident of the State of New York. For a period in excess of 11 years I have been an officer of the Department of State;

2. I have known — for approximately 8 years. I can recall meeting him at dinner at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. Carr at a time when Carr and I were employed in the Trade Agreements Division of the Department of State;

3. Since that time I can recall having seen him on one or two other occasions at dinner at the Carr's home. In addition to this I have dined once or twice at — home and he had dined once or twice at my home;

4. In the course of the past year or 18 months during which I have been a resident of New York and engaged in the work of the Department there, I can recall having dined with — on two occasions when he was in New York as an adviser to the American Delegation in the Economic and Social Council. Our conversations on these occasions touched upon the subjects of communism, Soviet foreign policy, and Russia;

5. During the entire period of my acquaintance with — and on the basis of our various meetings as set out above I have no recollection of having heard him make any statement or express any opinion which would indicate to me that he is a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or

in any way disloyal to the United States. Since I have known — no information has come to my attention from any other source suggesting or indicating that — is a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or in any way disloyal to the United States;

6. This affidavit is made for submission to the Loyalty and Security Board of the Department of State.

JOHN C. ROSS.

Sworn to before me this 29th day of October 1948.

LEONARD R. MOREY,
Vice Consul of the United States of America.

PARIS, FRANCE, October 15, 1948.

LOYALTY AND SECURITY BOARD,
Washington, D. C.:

LOYALTY OF —

I have known Mr. — as an economist in the Department of State for about 2 years. During that time I have been special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and Deputy United States Representative in the Economic and Social Council. In these capacities, I have had repeated occasion to observe and work with Mr. — both within United States delegations to the General Assembly and to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and in preparatory work in the Department of State for meetings of these and related bodies.

On every occasion I have always found Mr. — a loyal and useful citizen. His contributions have been valuable and positive as an assistant in preparing American positions on issues coming before the Economic and Social Council and as an adviser to the United States spokesman. His views have uniformly been opposed to the policies of other delegations which were antagonistic to the policies and interests of the United States. His relations with members of other delegations have, so far as my observation goes, been entirely correct and discreet. On no occasion have I ever had any evidence tending to cast doubt on his loyalty to the United States.

To the best of my knowledge and belief, Mr. — is a thoroughly loyal employee of the United States Government. Nothing has ever come to my attention which would cast any doubt on his behavior or judgment in matters of security.

LEROY D. STINEBOWER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of October 1948.

LEONARD R. MOREY,
Vice Consul of the United States of America.

CITY OF WASHINGTON,
District of Columbia, ss.:

I, Irving G. Rudd, residing at 4709 Alton Place NW, Washington, D. C., being duly sworn, depose and say:

That I am a citizen of the United States of America.

That prior to the war I was partner in D. M. Minton and Co., 111 Broadway, New York City, members of the New York Stock Exchange, and that I am now engaged in international trade and shipping as president of Trade Abroad, Inc. and treasurer of Earley-Walter, Inc., located at 1010 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.

That between November 1941 and July 1944, I was a staff member of the U. S. S. R. Division of the Office of Strategic Services and its predecessor agency, the Office of Coordinator of Information.

That I met Mr. — in the fall of 1943 while I was Chief of the Industrial and Military Supply Section of U. S. S. R. Division, Office of Strategic Services, in connection with Mr. — application for a position as a staff member in my section.

That after careful examination of Mr. — qualifications, I recommended his appointment to the Chief of the U. S. S. R. Division.

That the appointment of Mr. — was duly made on or about May 1, 1944, after the security check was satisfactorily completed.

That during the time Mr. — worked under my direction he performed his duties in a most capable and conscientious manner and made important contributions to the several projects which were at that time under study in my section.

That I became well acquainted with Mr. — during our association in the Office of Strategic Services and that our friendship continued after my resignation from the U. S. S. R. Division of OSS.

That while I was Special Assistant to the Chairman of the War Production Board until the beginning of 1945 and afterward when I returned to private business, Mr. — and I met at frequent intervals and more recently, during the summer of last year, Mr. — and his family resided for a period of 2 weeks as our neighbors at Dewey Beach, Del.

That it has been called to my attention that during recent investigation of Mr. — record allegations have been made by certain persons that he was sympathetic to the Communist cause. On the basis of my acquaintance with Mr. — during the last 5 years, I can vouch for his integrity and can state unequivocally that in my opinion he is a loyal citizen of the United States.

IRVING G. RUDD.

Sworn to before me this 25th day of October 1948.

[SEAL] PATRICK H. MCCORMICK,
Notary Public.

To the Loyalty and Security Board, Department of State, Washington, D. C.:

This is to certify:

1. That I first met — and his wife — about 1942 and saw them socially on a number of occasions prior to my departure for London in 1944.

2. That my acquaintance with them was sufficient to give me a clear impression of their characters and to cause me to regard them with great liking and respect.

3. That I have never heard or known of anything that would suggest in any way that they are or have been members of the Communist Party or sympathetic toward communism, or that would in any way bring their loyalty to the United States into question.

HARRY C. HAWKINS,
Foreign Service Officer, Retired; formerly Director, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of State; and Minister-Counselor for Economic Affairs, American Embassy, London.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Middlesex County, ss.:

Subscribed and sworn to by said Harry C. Hawkins, before me this 16th day of October 1948, at Arlington, Mass.

[SEAL] JOHN J. BURTON,
Notary Public.

My commission expires December 13, 1951.

NOVEMBER 1, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am presently employed, since August 1947, as an economist, grade P-6, in the Division of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President. I was previously, since June 1938, with the United States Housing Authority, later the Federal Public Housing Administration and now the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency. I have known

— since the fall of 1938 when he joined the staff of USHA.

I was fairly closely associated professionally with Mr. — during the entire time, October 1938 to September 1943; he was at USHA. At the beginning of that time we were in different sections of the same division. In about January 1941 he was transferred to the section of which I was chief. A few months later he was transferred to the position of regional research adviser, the regional counterpart of the position I held in the central office, but for about a year he was located in Washington so that I maintained frequent contacts with him. After his office was moved to Chicago in March 1942, until he went into the army in the fall of 1943, I saw him less frequently although I kept in close touch with his work.

In all of our work together, approximately 5 years, I found Mr. — to be competent, sincere, discreet, honest, and trustworthy. During that time, and since he returned to Washington in the spring of 1944 when I have seen and talked with him only occasionally, I have never heard Mr. — say anything which would lead me to suspect his loyalty or devotion to the United States.

PAUL F. KRUEGER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this — day of November 1948, in Washington, D. C.

[SEAL] MARTHA E. HELWEGE,
Notary Public.

My commission expires June 14, 1953.

OCTOBER 18, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

My wife, Marjorie Stewart Johnson, and myself became friends with — very soon after they came to Chicago, and saw them frequently until their departure for Washington.

My wife met — at the first assembly for obtaining ration books. In the natural confusion, the two women were attracted to each other in sympathetic understanding. My wife told me that evening about Mrs. — and soon after, I met her and —.

We four became friends, with like sympathies and appreciation of the important elements of human conduct, music, theater, books, art.

We sensed deeply that — are gentle, tolerant, wise people of fine sensibility and deep understanding, who knew, as we agreed in discussion, that the highest human values reside in a system where government, by all the people, operates for the good of all the people. And that any system wherein the individual is forced to exist for the state, which inevitably means for a small group of selfish, powered people—no matter what the tag—Communist, Fascist—is a wicked cheat of human dignity and freedom.

I have not known two finer, more kindly people, deeply perceptive of the essential values of life and, as such, vigorously aware of the favored climate this country supplies for the healthy development of those values, than —.

I am, and have been for the last 24 years, art director for Reincke, Meyer & Finn, advertising, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. I am a veteran of the First World War and during World War II was sponsor for a Japanese alien for the United States Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE NOEL JOHNSON.

REPUBLIC OF FRANCE, CITY OF PARIS,
Embassy of the United States of America, ss.:

Before me, Leonard R. Morey, vice consul of the United States of America, duly commissioned and qualified, personally came Ossip Bernstein, doctor at law, exporter, who, being duly sworn, deposes and says that:

He was a member of the Moscow bar, and was forced to leave Russia in 1920. He lives

since then in Paris, as a naturalized French citizen (naturalized in 1933). He knows _____ and his whole family for more than 35 years. _____ parents and grandparents were very honorable people, industrialists. He knew thoroughly Mr. _____ background, education and behavior from childhood on and during his life in western Europe. He had very often the opportunity to see Mr. _____ and to follow his development and life. He certifies that he has never seen or heard anything suspicious about Mr. _____ like sympathy for communism or Soviet Russia. He considers Mr. _____ as an honest, straightforward and loyal person, unable of any Communist or other un-American activity.

Dr. O. S. BERNSTEIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of October 1948.

[SEAL] LEONARD R. MOREY,
Vice Consul of the United States
of America, Paris, France.

AFFIDAVIT OF DR. JOSEPH KEMLER

STATE OF FLORIDA,
County of Dade:

Before me, a notary public in and for the State of Florida at large, personally appeared Joseph I. Kemler, who being duly sworn states that he is a citizen of the United States and that he is a resident of Baltimore, Md., residing at No. 1908 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md. Affiant further says that he is engaged in the practice of medicine at said address, specializing in otolaryngology, having practiced in said city since the year 1911. Affiant further says that he is a member of the American Medical Association; that he is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons; that he is a fellow of the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology; that he is chief of the otolaryngology department of Sinai Hospital of Baltimore, Md., and also chief of laryngologists of Mount Pleasant Sanitarium in Baltimore County, a member of the staff of the Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat Hospital of Baltimore, Md., and on the teaching staff of the University of Maryland, and the originator of the operation for cancer of the larynx, known as the Kemler bilateral thyrotomy for carcinoma of the larynx. Affiant further says that he is in Miami at the invitation of the Southern Medical Association to present his operation at the scientific exhibition of this meeting.

Affiant further says that he is making this affidavit in behalf of _____, who are under investigation by the United States Government in connection with the United States Government's employee loyalty program.

Affiant further says that he and _____ are first cousins and that he has known _____ since the year 1936 and that he has known her husband _____ since the year 1938, but since said dates he has seen and talked with both _____ many times, and he has had numerous conversations with them on philosophical, political, and educational subjects. As is usual in conversations between friends and relatives the talks were frank and intimate without reservations or evasions, and affiant was in a position to learn the real opinions on social and political subjects which were held by _____. Affiant is therefore in a position to state that neither _____ were ever Communists or Communist sympathizers. On the contrary they were always strongly opposed to totalitarian systems of government whether Communist, Nazi, or Fascist.

Affiant further says that _____ and _____, her husband, have always held in abhorrence the Communist system of government under which the individual is deprived of the basic freedoms to which the individual is entitled in a democratic state. They have always been opposed to the Communist practice which subjugates the indi-

vidual and makes a fearsome robot of him. They have always been contemptuous of a system under which elections are not free, but the individual is given one set of candidates to either vote for or against. On all the foregoing matters they have frequently expressed themselves in clear and unmistakable language.

Affiant further says that both _____ are persons of fine character and high intelligence. They are idealistically inclined and are keenly interested in philosophy and education. I consider them both to be worthy citizens of the United States of America, strong adherents of the American form of government, who as the parents of two children are very much interested in rearing them to be good Americans. They fully subscribe to the Constitution of the United States and I am sure they would hold in abhorrence anyone who would wish to overthrow or undermine our system of government.

JOSEPH I. KEMLER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me at Miami, Dade County, Fla., this 23d day of October 1948.

[SEAL] SAM SIMONHOFF,
Notary Public, State of Florida at Large.
My commission expires January 8, 1952.

BRADENTON, FLA., November 1, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to state that I have known _____ since we were small children (3 or 4 years of age) and that we were especially close friends at Lower Merion Junior and Senior High Schools, Ardmore, Pa., from 1928 to 1933. Since we lived near each other in Gladwyne, Pa., we were frequent visitors in each other's homes. I knew her mother, father, sister Bella, and her brother Norman, also. Each of her family was civic minded and a respected citizen of the community. Neither _____ nor any of her family ever participated in communistic or any subversive or radical activities either in or out of school.

During school days we sang together in the chorus, often rehearsed our numbers at each other's homes, and traveled to and from concerts together. Since we did not have a radio at our house, I recall enjoying numerous programs with _____ and her family. Our interest in needlework brought us together often for sewing and conversation centering on school and its activities. Sports was always a chief topic for we were both very proud of our school's athletic records. We were ardent fans and could be found together at most home games. We shared our enthusiasm for hiking and tennis with other girls in the neighborhood. We, also, participated together in the dramatic club activities.

Following high school, I attended State Teachers College at Buffalo, N. Y., taught home economics for 5 years near Buffalo, and in 1942, married Melvin J. Bates, also a teacher. With our two small children we are now residing in Bradenton, Fla. My husband teaches math., science, and shop in Palmetto Junior High, Palmetto, Fla. I am teaching home economics and science in the same school.

I have always found _____ to be a true and loyal person and have valued our friendship these many years.

RUTH HARRISON BATES.
Signed before me this 2d day of November 1948.

W. W. WHITE, Jr.,
Notary Public, State of Florida at Large.
My commission expires October 1, 1951.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I want the floor in my own right.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut—

Mr. McMAHON. I yielded to the Senator from Oregon, and sent him the file.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Nebraska to know that I want him to have the floor just as soon as I finish this discussion.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Missouri as soon as he can.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Both the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Missouri were claiming the floor at the same time, and the Chair recognized the Senator from Connecticut instead of the Senator from Missouri, and the Chair feels under some obligation to recognize the Senator from Missouri when the Senator from Connecticut has yielded the floor.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it proper for the junior Senator from Oregon to ask unanimous consent to make a few very brief remarks on the letter which the Senator from Connecticut has introduced into the RECORD, which letter, I think, should have my comment at the time it is introduced, for very obvious reasons?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Connecticut is retaining the floor, he may, by unanimous consent, yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to yield to the Senator from Oregon, and hope that the unanimous consent may be forthcoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. As I have said, I understand that when I was out making a long-distance telephone call the Senator from Connecticut introduced a series of affidavits in regard to the unnamed person whom the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] was discussing this afternoon, and that one of those affidavits was a letter written by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear in regard to that letter, and therefore I desire to read it and disclose the persons about whom it was written, and to whom the letter was written.

The letter is dated October 26, 1948.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator state whether I heard him correctly to say that he was going to divulge the name?

Mr. MORSE. I am going to read the entire letter.

Mr. McMAHON. Giving the name of the subject?

Mr. MORSE. I most certainly am.

Mr. McMAHON. Both the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Connecticut have carefully crossed out the subject's name.

Mr. MORSE. I will assume full responsibility for the disclosure.

Mr. McMAHON. I might say that I was in communication with the subject, and I got permission from him, because I could not get it from the State Department, to read the affidavits into the RECORD, providing, of course, the name was not divulged. Of course I cannot prevent the Senator from Oregon from going into it.

Mr. MORSE. I understand how the subject might take that attitude, but the name of the Senator from Oregon has been discussed publicly on the floor of the Senate, and now the name of the subject is going to be discussed publicly on the floor of the Senate. Any statement the Senator from Connecticut made to the subject cannot be binding upon the Senator from Oregon now that his name has become involved in this debate.

Mr. President, from 1936 to 1938 or the first part of 1939 the junior Senator from Oregon was an assistant to the Attorney General of the United States under the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. My distinguished superior officer was the present senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. I do not know of a more pleasant association I have ever had in my life than my association with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and the other members of the Department of Justice with whom I worked during those years when I served as director and editor in chief of the Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures. Release procedures is a legal term which encompasses within its definition pardon, probation, and parole.

The Attorney General's survey started out as a WPA project for white collar workers in the United States among lawyers and statisticians and similar professional people who at that time were on relief. I was not on relief, but I was selected to direct this particular research study in criminal law administration and we employed many professional people who were on relief.

I had some 2,000 people on the payroll during the first part of the study. We made a Nation-wide study, State by State, of the administration of pardon, parole, probation, and prison administration in the United States.

The individual under discussion this afternoon happened to be one of the 2,000 or more employees on the Nation-wide staff of the survey. He was selected by and worked for the then dean of the Stetson Law School, of Florida, Paul Raymond, now a prominent attorney in Daytona Beach, Fla. He assisted Dean Raymond in the research connected with the parole volume that was subsequently published under my editorship. Dean Raymond was one of my most able associates on the survey and he is a fine lawyer and loyal citizen.

Mr. President, that is the background I wish to report to the Senate as to my connection with the individual who has been discussed at much length this afternoon by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The letter I addressed to the Loyalty Board speaks for itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would yield to me to make for the RECORD some showing as to the quality of the Florida citizen who has been mentioned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is speaking in the time of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MORSE. When I get through with the letter, I intend to enlarge upon my remarks about Mr. Raymond. If, when I finish with that, the Senator from Florida wishes to comment further upon Mr. Raymond and the Senator from Connecticut can get permission for him to do so, I shall have no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to have the privilege.

Mr. MORSE. The letter reads as follows:

THE LOYALTY SECURITY BOARD,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
NEW STATE DEPARTMENT BUILDING,
Washington 25, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have just received a telephone call from Mr. Paul E. Raymond, an attorney of Daytona Beach, Fla., formerly dean of the John B. Stetson Law School of Florida, in regard to Mr. Edward G. Posniak. Mr. Raymond informs me that Mr. Posniak, an employee of the State Department, is being investigated by the Loyalty Security Board on charges that he is or has been a Communist.

Mr. Raymond was on my staff in the United States Department of Justice from 1936 to 1938, when I was Director of the Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures. He served as director and editor of that phase of the study which dealt with the subject of parole. One of Mr. Raymond's assistants on the editorial staff was Mr. Edward G. Posniak, who had been appointed as a sociologist to assist the editorial board with some of the sociological problems involved in parole procedures.

As director and editor in chief of the entire Survey, I came to know Mr. Posniak in connection with his work of our staff. On the basis of his professional work for the Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures during the period of time indicated above, he gave no indication at all that he held even friendly feelings toward the communistic ideology. In fact, it would be a great surprise to me, as well as a keen disappointment if, since leaving his work in the Department of Justice, Mr. Posniak had developed even the slightest sympathy for the Communist philosophy.

Of course I did not know Mr. Posniak intimately outside of his office, but my recollection of him is that he was always a rather emphatic opponent of the totalitarian view, be it of fascism, nazism, or communism. As I recall Mr. Posniak came to the United States from Poland, but I am not certain about that. However, I do recall distinctly that he was very critical in those days of the totalitarian philosophy which was sweeping Europe in Germany and Italy as well as in Russia.

Nevertheless, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I have had no contacts with Mr. Posniak whatsoever since 1938, and I am in no position to pass any reliable judgment whatsoever upon his political, social, economic, or religious philosophy since he served on the Department of Justice staff at the same time I was there. Also, I wish to make perfectly clear that if there is any evidence against Mr. Posniak which establishes the fact that he is a Communist or a fellow traveler, then I am very much of the opinion that he and all others of like point of view should be discharged from holding any position in our Federal Government.

However, in fairness to Mr. Posniak, for whatever value it may prove to be worth in light of any evidence which has been developed subsequent to his service with the Department of Justice, I think it is only right to give you my impression that when he was associated on Mr. Raymond's editorial staff in connection with the parole phase of our study, Mr. Posniak gave no indication that he held any sympathy whatsoever for any form of totalitarianism, including communism.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, I hesitated to read this letter, but on the other hand, when a letter of mine is introduced into the RECORD—and I have no objection to its being introduced into the RECORD—so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, from that point on no names mentioned in the letter are going to be withheld from the Senate. It would not be fair to me not to make a full disclosure of the person involved in this case now that my name has been mentioned in connection with it?

Believe me, Mr. President, when I become involved in any matter of this nature, I care not how incidental or minor the involvement may be, I am going to produce, so far as I am concerned, the full record. I am not going to conceal any names. I think it is just such secrecy that leads to unfounded rumors and serious misunderstandings.

I want to say with regard to the former dean of the Stetson Law School, Mr. Raymond, that he is a very good friend of mine. He was on my law faculty in the University of Oregon for 1 year during the early 1930's. He was a teacher of superior ability. He is a former resident of the State of Iowa. He is a graduate, as I recall, of the University of Iowa Law School. He is a fine citizen, and I am satisfied, Mr. President, that the views I expressed in my letter would be the views of Dean Raymond. If Dean Raymond had any evidence presented to him which either indicated that this man or any other man was even sympathetic to communism, he would want to see to it that such a person was eliminated from the State Department. That is the view I expressed in my letter. It has always been my view. On the basis of the very limited professional relation I had with Mr. Posniak while he was serving on Dean Raymond's staff, I had no reason to believe that he was sympathetic with totalitarianism in any form, including communism. As I said in my letter to the State Department Loyalty Board, I have had no contacts with him, so far as my recollection is concerned, since 1938. I do not know what has transpired in regard to him since 1938. But believe me, if he is even a sympathizer with the Communist philosophy, then he ought to be eliminated from the State Department, as I said in my letter. If, on the other hand, he is innocent of any connection whatsoever with the Communist cause, then I think the Loyalty Board owes it to him to clear him.

I do not know officially what action the Loyalty Board has taken, but in view of the fact that, if I correctly understood the conversation here today, he is still

in the State Department, and in view of the fact that a hearing was held on him, I assume he was cleared, but I do not know that to be a fact.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator will have to ask the Senator from Connecticut to yield. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has the floor. So far as I am concerned, I should be glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who wishes, I believe, to make a comment regarding Mr. Raymond.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I simply wanted it to appear clearly in the Record, for any good purpose that may be subserved—and I wish the Senator from Oregon would give attention, if he will—that Dean Raymond is regarded in our State as a very splendid and high grade American. He came to Florida, I believe, from the University of Oregon. He was dean of the law school of the John B. Stetson University. He went from there to become an able member of the staff of the Attorney General of Florida, as an assistant attorney general, and from there went into the armed forces as an officer in the Navy during the war, where he served with ability and distinction.

I do not know how his name comes into this matter, but I wanted it clearly to appear that Dean Raymond is a citizen of undoubted patriotism and an attorney of very high reputation in our State, where he is well and most favorably known.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I want to associate myself with what he has said about Dean Raymond, and I want the Record to show that Dean Raymond happens to be one of my very best friends.

Mr. DONNELL secured the floor.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. As I understand, the Senator is a lawyer; is he not?

Mr. DONNELL. Well, that is my profession.

Mr. McCARTHY. And has been for a number of years?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, let me say for the Record that the senior Senator from Missouri is a very distinguished lawyer, and has been for many years in Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin. Let Senators speak one at a time.

Mr. DONNELL. I have yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the Senator from Missouri agree with me that we have demonstrated here a very, very dangerous picture of the loyalty procedure? Have we not also had demonstrated a very dangerous picture of how the committee has acted? Have we not

had demonstrated on the floor, for example, what has occurred after the loyalty board has received positive, uncontradicted evidence that a State Department official, together with his wife, belonged to the Communist Party; that they had in their home a man who was a known party member, with the positive admission on the part of the wife that she roomed with the two women who were "probably Communists"? We have all that positive testimony of a man having belonged to the party. Then the attorney for the accused man goes out, in this case one of Dean Acheson's law partners, and secures affidavits, negative testimony from people saying "We do not know he was a Communist." And because they have been able to find 21 persons who do not know this man was a Communist, they then use that testimony to offset all the positive testimony. Under that theory of the law, affidavits of a few hundred people that they did not know that the Senator was from Missouri would prove he was from some other part of the world.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I do not care to engage in discussion of the question at issue between the Senator from Wisconsin and those who may oppose his views. My remarks today are addressed to another question. The question is a very simple one, and I think a very important one. I trust the Senator from Wisconsin will not take offense at my not going into the subject matter of which he is speaking.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly again?

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator may not care to discuss this matter, but I should like to get it into the Record. Does the Senator agree with me that after a man such as Alger Hiss is proved to be a member of the party, an espionage agent, he is able to secure witnesses, Supreme Court Justices, if you please, prominent men to testify that they do not know he is a Communist, that they do not know he is an agent, does not the fact that he can secure such prominent men to come forth and testify for him indicate that he is much more dangerous than the Communist who is recognized by everyone as such?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator has presented in his question the point which he has in mind. Of course, I think we all realize that any individual who is capable of commanding the favorable attention of great outstanding men such as members of the Supreme Court, has it within his power to be not merely a power for good but also a power for evil if those characteristics are inherent in him. This afternoon I shall not undertake to discuss Alger Hiss or any of the other dramatic personae who have been mentioned here this afternoon.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator to yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DONNELL. If I may do so without losing the floor I shall do it with pleasure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Missouri yielding to the Senator from Arizona, without losing the floor? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been trying to work out a plan by which we can give some consideration today to the appropriation bill, which is the unfinished business. I understand the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] desires to make a few remarks at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, and that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] also desires to address the Senate.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that after those remarks have been concluded, that the remainder of the day be devoted to the unfinished business, the appropriation bill, and that debate upon amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes to each Senator, and that all remarks be germane to the amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that we are going to have a night session unless we can devote 2 hours to the appropriation bill. The procedure of using all the time for speeches on matters not related to the unfinished business must cease.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I did not yield for the purpose of anything other than a unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield, although I should like to proceed with the subject matter which I wish to discuss, and I do not desire to go into extraneous matters.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Missouri may not wish to discuss this question now; if so, I hope perhaps he will discuss it later: Is the Senator aware of the fact that at the time when Mr. X was working on the project described by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], Mr. X was then a citizen of Russia, and did not become a naturalized citizen of the United States until 1939?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am not aware of the Posniak matter; but I wish to say that I have been impressed with the earnestness and stick-to-it-iveness and courage of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] in presenting the matters he has discussed today and previous to today; and I wish to pay tribute to him for those qualities, which he has evidenced here on the floor of the Senate.

However, Mr. President, my purpose today is not to discuss the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Maryland or Mr. Posniak or Mr. Hiss. Indeed, my remarks are addressed, as I have indicated, to a question which I

consider to be a very important one. It is a question which arises out of recent happenings in connection with the subcommittee which was headed by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and it relates to the report which was presented and filed, concerning which the Senate has already heard much.

The question I desire to discuss is this: Is it proper that Report No. 2108, Eighty-first Congress, second session, be circulated with its cover page containing the words "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations"?

Mr. President, the importance of this question is inherent in the facts which have been disclosed before the Senate. If the report is a report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is entirely proper that it be circulated under that title. By so doing, it carries much prestige and much weight and much validity, because the Committee on Foreign Relations, headed, as it is, by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], has in its membership 12 other Senators, all of whom are noted and stand high in the United States. I shall not mention the names of the Senators who were on the subcommittee, although I wish to point out that I do not refrain from stating their names at this time because of any desire to discriminate against them or to make any intimation whatsoever regarding them. To the contrary, I desire to point out that in addition to them—men whose names have been so prominently featured in the debate during the last few days—the other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations include the following: the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], whom I have already mentioned, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], in addition—and perhaps in justice to them, I should specifically state for the RECORD all the names of the members of the subcommittee—to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

I say that if this report goes forth to the American public with the title "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations"—a committee which consists of the eminent Members of the Senate to whom I have just referred—it will carry a tremendous amount of weight.

Of course, even if the report goes forth as a report of the subcommittee, it will carry weight commensurate with the stature of those who served on the subcommittee. However, there is a very great difference between a report of a subcommittee which is presented to the committee which has created it, a report which is subordinate to that com-

mittee, a report which can be reviewed by the committee which created the subcommittee, and a report of a full committee itself—a full committee which, after careful study and deliberation, shall have passed upon the contents of the report and shall have promulgated it to the Nation as an official report of the entire committee.

So, Mr. President, I say it is no mere idle or technical or formal question which is asked, when I inquire this afternoon whether it is proper that Report No. 2108 be circulated with its cover page containing the words "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations."

Mr. President, I now hold in my hand Senate Resolution No. 316, which has been submitted by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. It has not been acted upon as yet by the Senate; but the resolution indicates something of the importance of determining once and for all whether this report is actually a report of the Committee on Foreign Relations or whether it is merely a report of a subcommittee.

If it is a report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, there is no objection to having the report circulated as such. On the other hand, if the report is merely a report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, there is all the objection in the world to sending forth the report to the people of the Nation as an official report of the entire committee of 13 members who deal with the subject matter of foreign relations.

Mr. President, the resolution (S. Res. 316) submitted by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], was submitted on July 21 of this year, and reads as follows:

Whereas Report No. 2108, entitled "State Department Employee Loyalty Investigation," as printed and distributed on July 21—

I pause to call attention to the fact that the report is so printed and distributed that it is described on the cover page as "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations." I turn now to the resolution. After the words "printed and distributed on July 21," we find in Senate Resolution 316 the following—differs from the report submitted to the Senate on July 20 in certain important respects, particularly in being called on the cover sheet a report of the committee; and

Whereas it does not appear that the Foreign Relations Committee has adopted the report; and

Whereas a false impression of the status of this report will be spread abroad by the cover which has been substituted since it was received by this body: Therefore be it

Resolved, That said Report No. 2108 be at once withdrawn from distribution until the cover be replaced to agree with that covering the report as submitted.

Mr. President, deeming the question of whether the document which has been printed and prepared for circulation, and doubtless already to some extent has been circulated, is or is not a report of the committee whose report it purports to be, I made this statement to the Senate on the afternoon of July 21, as shown at page 10785 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I am going to the committee—

I was referring to the Foreign Relations Committee—

to find out, if I can what the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, with respect to this report, and to bring to the Senate information as to what the action was.

Mr. President, a little later this afternoon I shall tell the Senate what has been done in pursuance of that promise, as so made by me.

On July 20, 1950, the senior Senator from Maryland sent to the desk a report entitled "Report of a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations Pursuant to Senate Resolution 231, A Resolution to Investigate Whether There Are Employees in the State Department Disloyal to the United States, Together With Individual Views of Senator LODGE."

It will be observed that the quotation which I have just read, which appears upon the cover page of the document sent to the desk, on July 20, by the senior Senator from Maryland, includes the words "Report of a Subcommittee"—and I emphasize by my voice the word "Subcommittee." There was no statement upon that occasion, Mr. President, that the report was the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The senior Senator from Maryland stated, at or about the time he sent to the desk this report, that he was instructed by the full committee to submit to the Senate, "and that" he stated, "I now do." That is on page 10686 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Vice President announced, "The report is filed."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, speaking a few moments later, said:

It does not mean that any members of the committee agreed to it, if I correctly understand the action that was taken. I understood that the full committee merely transmitted the report, just the same as the Post Office Department transmits a letter from one person to another. That is clear from the record.

A moment later, another member of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I refer to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] took the floor and said:

Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I rise to take issue with the statement just made by the Senator from Maryland and say that the report is not a report of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Within a few minutes, however, the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said:

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I appointed the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. It made the investigation, and as a subcommittee, reported to the Foreign Relations Committee.

That committee, as the Committee on Foreign Relations, adopted a motion that the report of the subcommittee be reported to the Senate—not as the report of the subcommittee, but as the report of the full committee. I, as chairman of the full committee, designated the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], for the full committee, to make the report to the United States Senate.

That is all there is to the matter, so far as I know. Our records show that.

Mr. President, later in the same afternoon, July 20, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] spoke further upon this question, and I quote a portion of what he said:

As I have said, after the report had been received by the committee and the subcommittee was discharged—and we had all voted for it, because we thought it was the proper disposition of the matter—it was moved that the Committee on Foreign Relations transmit to the Senate through the chairman, or someone designated by him, the report of the subcommittee without comment one way or another. I voted for that with the distinct understanding that it was simply carrying out the wishes of the subcommittee chairman that the matter be transmitted to the Senate as a subcommittee report for such use as the Senate might see fit to make of it.

Continuing, the Senator from New Hampshire said:

I distinctly understood that it was not a report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I doubt that anyone except the chairman of the subcommittee had read the report.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I pause to say that this report is one of 170 printed pages, attached to one, in fact, with an addendum of two further pages and appendixes, of approximately 175 additional pages. And the Senator from New Jersey said:

I doubt that anyone except the chairman of the subcommittee had read the report. I do not know that anyone else ever had a chance to read it. There was no discussion of its merits. The entire discussion was on procedure, and on the procedural question it was distinctly understood that we were merely having the report sent to the Senate by the chairman of the full committee, or someone designated by him. He very properly designated the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who had been chairman of the subcommittee. I recollect very clearly that what was to be submitted to the Senate was the subcommittee report without comment. I want to make it clear, Mr. President, that it was to be the subcommittee report without comment, because there seems to be some misunderstanding as to what the committee did. Certainly I would not have voted "yea" on that motion if in doing so it meant that the committee was accepting the report and sending it to the Senate as the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. While there was some discussion of whether we would debate the merits of the report and approve it or disapprove it we agreed that no one knew enough about it to discuss the merits. Consequently no vote was taken to approve or disapprove the report.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] simply stated that he wanted to submit his report, to have it received by the committee, and to have the subcommittee discharged. After that we could do anything we wanted to do with respect to it. Following that a member of the subcommittee made the motion that the report be transmitted to the Senate through the chairman of the subcommittee, but only as a subcommittee report without comment. It is clear in my mind that it meant we were not passing on it, but simply sending it to the Senate without comment, because we had all agreed that we did not have time to read it or pass comment on it.

I want to make my position clear, because those are the facts as I remember them. If

any other member of the committee wishes to take issue with me, he may do so, but I thought that I must make this statement. I do so because it was perfectly clear that no position was taken one way or the other by the committee. We were simply transmitting to the Senate the report of the subcommittee. The form of the document as submitted is the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to this resolution with a deletion of some language that reflected on the minority members of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, we have thus heard from several of the Senators, members of the Foreign Relations Committee, speaking promptly during the session at which the Senator from Maryland presented this report, cover-leafed as it was with the words "Report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations." Within a few minutes after the remarks of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] had been completed, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] rose, and in the course of the remarks on which he soon entered, said:

Then the motion was made, if you please, Mr. President, to transmit this document to the Senate, and the chairman was authorized to designate a member to transmit it to the Senate.

Mr. President, if Senators will read the record of the Foreign Relations Committee at that meeting they will find that there was discussion about the particular meaning of the words which were used, and that "transmit" was used to indicate that the full committee was only a conduit by which this document, developed by three members of the subcommittee, could flow onto the Senate floor. The word "transmit" was used advisedly, and in the records of the Foreign Relations Committee it will be found that the discussion of whether or not the committee should take action on this document was pushed aside, and the members of the committee said they would take no action except the transmittal of this particular document.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee never approved this document—

I am still quoting from the Senator from Iowa, a member of that committee. He said:

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee never approved this document, never adopted it as the act of the Foreign Relations Committee, and there is no statement of adoption in the record of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, I believe the statements I am making are accurate. They are certainly as I remember them, and I have been in some intimate association with this committee.

I invite the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, to the fact that there was a particular reason why the Senator from Iowa would remember so accurately the tenor of the discussion and what was the intent of the members of the committee, because he was one of the members of the subcommittee whose report, or the document purporting to be its report, was thus under discussion.

Mr. President, in the course of the remarks of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in the Senate on July 20, he also said:

Therefore, I raised the question whether it was officially a report of the subcommit-

tee, because no meeting was held for the purpose of approving or rejecting it.

So, Mr. President, we observe that a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who was not on the subcommittee, raised this very interesting question, not merely the one as to whether this was a report of the committee, but whether it was even a report of the subcommittee. I shall have something more to say upon that very interesting question in a moment.

In the course of the remarks of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] on July 20, he spoke also to similar effect, raising the question, indeed putting it somewhat more strongly, and saying that, in his judgment, there was no question that it was neither a report of the committee nor a report of the subcommittee.

I should like to read what he said to the Senate on July 20:

Mr. President, we have been talking about the mechanics of this thing today. But above and beyond that, I think there can be little question; in fact, there is no question in my mind, that this is neither a report of the Foreign Relations Committee nor is it actually a report of the subcommittee, because, so far as I know, no meeting of the subcommittee was ever called to pass upon this report, at least so far as I, as a member of the minority on that subcommittee, received any notice.

Mr. President, the Senator, on the same day listened to the Senator from Iowa make this further statement, at page 10699:

Mr. President, this document—

Referring to the one which had been presented by the senior Senator from Maryland—

is a mysterious and a mysteriously prepared document. It is a document whose antecedents, paternity, and maternity might be open to some serious and rather revealing facets. It is a document whose generation raises question in the mind of anyone who has followed this matter rather carefully.

So it is not particularly surprising, Mr. President, to find that both the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Iowa raised the point, not solely the one which I have presented, namely, that the report which was presented obviously was one of the subcommittee, but they raised the further question as to whether it was even the report of the subcommittee, because no meeting of the subcommittee had been called to pass upon the report.

Mr. President, it was interesting and illuminating to the Members of the Senate, I am sure, on yesterday, to have their attention invited to the fact by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE] that a considerable number of pages, some 35 typewritten pages of transcript of the subcommittee proceedings, had been omitted from the printed volume which I hold in my hand, and at the request of the Senator from Massachusetts the omitted portion was set forth in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it appears, beginning with page 10815. I have only hastily scanned portions of that RECORD, but I find in the hasty scanning which I have given to it a

very interesting situation. I find, Mr. President, that the Senator from Maryland is reported at page 10817 as saying:

Make a motion, then, so we can get your point of view on paper.

He was addressing the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]; and in response, the Senator from Rhode Island said:

Well, I would suggest that the counsel for the committee make a draft report for this committee that we can discuss, in the first place. When you once have that draft report and have been over that, then we can discuss the findings.

Then, Mr. President, we go further over and find a discussion between the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as to whether the work was pretty well concluded. The Senator from Maryland said:

I think our work is pretty well concluded, if you want my opinion.

The Senator from Iowa said:

I do not think it is even started, Mr. Chairman.

What I am reading from is the proceedings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in executive session held on Wednesday, June 28, 1950, reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, after having been omitted from the official volume containing what purports to be the hearings before the subcommittee. It was the last day of the meetings of the subcommittee in the form of hearings, or the last day of the list of days set forth on the cover of the hearings. I find, as I go through, that after the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Iowa had discussed the question as to whether the work was pretty well completed, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] said:

It seems to me like a sensible thing to make use of our counsel to give us a brief of what we have already done.

Then we find my good and distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] a little later saying:

We must make some sort of report, must we not?

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said:

My position is that the thing we ought to do is to report out a resolution, setting up a trained bipartisan commission of experts to make an independent investigation.

The Senator from Rhode Island said:

That may be a conclusion, but we must make a report of what we have done, surely.

Then we go to page 10819, and the Senator from Maryland said this:

Let me suggest that counsel prepare a tentative report to submit to the members of this committee—

Listen to that, Mr. President—a tentative report—

to submit to the members of this committee, that each man prepare, if he wishes, such report as he wants and such recommendations as he wants, and that we pool those here and see if we can reach collectively or individually a basis for bringing our pres-

ent hearings to a close and passing it on with recommendations for further action.

(At this point Mr. DONNELL yielded to Mr. McFARLAND to propound a unanimous-consent request relating to the appropriation bill, and debate ensued, which appears at the conclusion of Mr. DONNELL's remarks.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it will be recalled in what I previously stated that the following was suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], which appears at page 10817 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday:

Well, I would suggest that the counsel for the committee make a draft report for this committee that we can discuss, in the first place.

So far as I have been able to find, Mr. President, there is nothing further emanating from the Senator from Rhode Island which could be construed to be a motion. Strictly speaking, I am not certain that what he said at that point could be considered a motion, because he says, "I would suggest." However, it is evidently treated as a motion by the subcommittee. At any rate, it is the only motion made by the Senator from Rhode Island, and his motion reads in this way:

Well, I would suggest that the counsel for the committee make a draft report for this committee—

For this committee. The Senator from Rhode Island refers to the subcommittee. Let us see what happened on this motion, if it be such, made by the Senator from Rhode Island. I quote from page 10819 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday:

Senator TYDINGS. All those in favor of the Green resolution will signify by saying "aye."

Senator GREEN. Aye.

Senator MCMAHON. Aye.

Senator TYDINGS. All those opposed signify by saying "No."

Senator LODGE. No.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. No.

Senator TYDINGS. Two votes "no" and two the other way.

Go ahead, Mr. Morgan, and prepare your report. The meeting is in recess.

Mr. President, I note with what I hope is not too obvious a sense of humor that the chairman of the committee did not actually cast a vote himself. I take it that the Senator would undoubtedly indicate that his direction, "go ahead, Mr. Morgan, and prepare your report," would be considered as a vote on his part. I make no point of that. I do make a point, however, in supplementing the line discussed by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from New Jersey as to whether or not this is even a report of the subcommittee, that the motion or the resolution that was carried, if the action of the Senator from Maryland in saying, "go ahead, Mr. Morgan, and prepare your report," may be considered the equivalent of a yea vote, was the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] that "the counsel for the committee make a draft report for this committee."

Mr. President, as to this document, or this draft report, if it may be termed

that, or, to use the language of the Senator from Maryland, this tentative report which the counsel was instructed to prepare and submit to "the members of this committee," followed by the direction of the Senator from Maryland to the counsel, Mr. Morgan, "Go ahead and prepare your report," it takes somewhat of a stretch of parliamentary imagination, to say nothing of parliamentary law, to consider that either the maternity or the paternity, to adopt the picturesque language of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], is clear. At least there is considerable doubt as to whether or not any official action was taken, so far as the record discloses, by the subcommittee toward the presentation of the report itself. That is entirely aside from the proposition as to whether or not the document is the report of the full committee as distinguished from the subcommittee.

In this state of the proceedings, as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 20 and the 21st, with the various statements of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the chairman of the committee [Mr. CONNALLY], all of them giving their views, we find that on July 21 there was received on the floor of the Senate copies of a report entitled "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations Pursuant to Senate Resolution 231, a Resolution to Investigate Whether There Are Employees in the State Department Disloyal to the United States."

Mr. President, there is nothing in the record to indicate that between July 20, when the document was presented by the Senator from Maryland with "Report of a subcommittee" on the outside of it, and the time on July 21 when there was presented some copies of a document entitled "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations" the Committee on Foreign Relations had taken any action to authorize the report to be changed from a report of the subcommittee to a report of the full committee. The document which appeared on the floor of the Senate on the afternoon of July 21 appears to be, although I have not read all the hundreds of pages, but have simply scanned through it, precisely the same as the report which had been presented on July 20 under the caption on the cover page "Report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations," save only for two very significant things. One is that upon the cover page the words "of a subcommittee" have been deleted. They cannot be found with the highest powered microscope, because they are not there any more. In the second place, on page numbered iii, which in the document presented and filed in this body on July 20 had read at the top "Contents. I. Report of a subcommittee," there has been deleted and eliminated the "I. Report of a subcommittee."

So, the document which we had on July 21, and a copy of which I had in my hand during the afternoon as the debate

progressed, and with reference to which I spoke as I had it in my hand, differs in important respects from the one which had been received on the day previous in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, in the course of the discussion which developed after the arrival of these new copies, with the deletions to which I have referred, which suddenly transformed, in effulgent beauty, the cover page from a mere report of the subcommittee to a report of the committee, occurred this colloquy:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The final vote was to transmit the report of the subcommittee to the Senate without recommendation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is absolutely in error, as he will ascertain if he will consult the transcript which he has in his hand—the original transcript. The motion was that the committee report to the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct. I apologize.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator moved that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee report to the Senate, through the chairman, or through someone designated by him, without comment.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But let me remark that that is the first place where the word "report" was used because throughout these particular proceedings, when the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] was discussing the question, he used the word "transmit."

Mr. CONNALLY. The committee did not vote on what the Senator from Florida said. They voted on the question stated by the chairman.

Mr. President, before I read what the Senator from New Jersey said, I wish to say that it was obvious that the Senator from Texas thought that if he made a motion that the committee "report" to the Senate, that the words thus used transformed this action of transmittal into one of adoption and reporting to the Senate a document adopted by the committee.

In the first place, Mr. President, I take it that this is a somewhat tenuous position, even taking the word at its technical meaning. But let me read something of the substance of what the committee had understood, as the Senator from New Jersey then proceeded:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It was the difference between the words "transmit" and "report"—that is, to "transmit" or "report" to the Senate the report of the subcommittee without comment. I will not argue with the Senator about the words. Either way, it means the same thing. Everyone understood it. It was understood that we were transmitting the report of the subcommittee, and that the committee itself was taking no action on it because the members of the committee admitted that they had not read the report. So how could they make a report they had not read?

I wish to pause, in fairness, to say that there is something to the point made by the Senator from Texas on the face of the record thus far which I have read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that by the use of the word "report," to which he called the attention of the Senator from New Jersey and others, even though it be

a tenuous ground, there is some basis, and perhaps some logical basis, for the Senator from Texas to take the position that what was then and thereafter being done was to report on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish to say, however, that a most interesting fact developed a little later from a Senator who had not been present at the meeting to which the Senator from Texas and the Senator from New Jersey referred. The Senator whom I mention as not having been at the meeting and who contributed something to the discussion was the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. On July 21, subsequent to the remarks made by the Senator from Texas and those by the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Wisconsin rose, and in the course of what he said is this exceedingly interesting statement of his recollection. After reciting that he had been out of town and just returned, and went to the Committee on the Judiciary that morning, where, if I am not mistaken, I remember seeing him myself, being a member of the same committee, he said:

My information as to what took place in the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee came to me later. As soon as I could, Tuesday afternoon, after hearing of the session of the Foreign Relations Committee, I did consult with the clerk of the committee and was briefed on the subject. I have since looked at the minutes briefly.

This is what he then said that is of particular interest:

In the motion which was made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in committee the word "transmit" was used. However, when the motion was stated by the chairman of the committee the word "report" was used.

In the meanwhile there had been a discussion in committee as to whether or not the committee would approve the report. As I recall, from a very brief analysis, and from what was told me, it was the consensus of those present that there could be no acceptance or approval of the report until the report had been studied.

Mr. President, I pause to call attention to the fact that I assume that we would agree that the chairman could not, by the mere change of a word, change the motion which had been made. The recollection of the Senator from Wisconsin is that in his motion the Senator from Florida used the word "transmit," but, as the Senator from Wisconsin further said:

However, when the motion was stated by the chairman of the committee, the word "report" was used. In the meanwhile there had been a discussion in the committee as to whether or not the committee would approve the report. As I recall, from a very brief analysis, and from what was told me, it was the consensus of those present that there could be no acceptance or approval of the report until the report had been studied.

Yes, Mr. President, this is a report of 170 printed pages, a great deal of it in very small type. For instance, I point at random to pages 120 and 121, which are in small type, and down at the bottom extended quotations from testimony. It would take a great deal of time to consider and deliberate on a report of 170

pages, with 175 additional pages, or thereabout, in appendices and addenda.

Then said the Senator from Wisconsin:

I shall have something to say later, but I believe in view of the general discussion here as to whether or not this is the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it is important that I at least express my own views on the report. The intent seems plain. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee meant to transmit the report but not approve the same.

The page on which these statements of the Senator from Wisconsin appear is 10788 of the RECORD of July 21.

Mr. President, I refer to the question to which I addressed myself at the outset of my remarks, namely, is it proper for Report No. 2103, Eighty-first Congress, second session, to be circulated with its title page containing the words "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations"?

In order to know whether or not it is proper to circulate this document to the public with the statement upon it that it is the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is essential, as I see it, to know whether the full committee did in fact adopt the subcommittee report as the report of the full committee.

The other afternoon I made the statement to the Senate, as I have previously indicated, that I was going to the committee to find out, if I could, what the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations was with respect to this report, and to bring to the Senate information as to what the action was. I did so. I went to the office of the Committee on Foreign Relations about 9 o'clock in the morning, immediately following our discussion here on the floor on July 22. I shall not give the Senate all the details of what transpired, because the Senate will observe in a moment that a letter was written by me subsequently in the morning, and a letter received back by me later on that day. I shall introduce those letters in a few moments into the RECORD.

I may say, Mr. President, that I have been orally assured by Dr. Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, that I am not required to keep confidential the contents of the letter dated July 22, 1950, from him to me, or the copy of certain comments by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the press on July 18, or the contents of the copies of certain motions which Dr. Wilcox kindly sent to me with his letter dated July 22. In a few moments I shall, however, have something to say about the use of those copies of certain motions derived, as they are, from the transcript.

Mr. President, I see Dr. Wilcox in the Chamber now, and I should like to say that with his usual and constant courtesy, he was very courteous to me. I could have not the slightest criticism of his courtesy to me on the occasion of my visit to him. I want to say to the Senate that to my mind we have, in Dr. Wilcox, a gentleman who is not only efficient, but who is trying to do his duty and who

is courteous to the Members of the Senate, whether they are members of the committee with which he is connected or not.

The letter which I sent to him on the morning of July 22 reads as follows:

JULY 22, 1950.

DR. FRANCIS O. WILCOX,
Chief of Staff of Senate Committee on
Foreign Relations, the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. WILCOX: This confirms the request which of you, as the chief of staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I made this morning on said committee for the privilege of reading the complete transcript of those proceedings of the committee with respect to the report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to Senate Resolution 231, which occurred at or after the presentation of said report to the committee. My request was accompanied by my statement to the effect that, if I be permitted to read those proceedings, I intend to copy such portion or all of them as I deem proper and present to the United States Senate such of said proceedings as I deem proper so to present. In our conversation this morning I made not only a request but a demand. On reconsideration, I withdraw the demand, but, as above stated, confirm the request.

This also confirms my request made this morning of you as the chief of staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for a copy of (a) the contents of motions made before the committee concerning said report after its presentation to the committee, and (b) the contents of statement made to the press by the chairman as to what motions had been acted on by the committee with respect to said report.

Kindly give to the committee this letter.

Yours very truly,

FORREST C. DONNELL.

Mr. President, I should like to supplement the letter by saying that Dr. Wilcox had and placed before me on the table on the morning of Saturday, July 22, what he informed me was a transcript of the proceedings, and it would have been entirely possible for me to have opened it and read it. In fact, it was entirely agreeable to him that I should do so. But he made it clear to me that he deemed it to be his duty, and I respect him for doing what he thought was his duty, to inform me of what he deemed to be the practice, that information so received by Senators from reading such transcripts was to be kept confidential. I declined, Mr. President, to look inside the book to see what was in it with that confidence imposed upon me, because the purpose of my going there was to secure access to the book in order to see what transpired, and bring the information to the Senate.

I may say also with regard to the question of the demand, that I did make a demand, not merely a request but a demand but on reflection it appeared to me that perhaps I had gone somewhat too far, and that a request would be sufficient to make my point, and that it would be more respectful to the committee to confine my attitude to a request rather than to a demand. Therefore, on reconsideration, as pointed out in my letter of July 22 to Dr. Wilcox, I withdrew the demand, but, as therein stated, confirmed the request.

As I was at the luncheon table on July 22—and this shows something of the promptness of Dr. Wilcox in bringing to me a response to my letter—he personally came to me into the Senate restaurant in the Capitol and bore with him three items which he handed to me in an envelope, and which I have subsequently read. One of them is a letter dated July 22, 1950, on the letterhead of "United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations," listing the names of the members of the committee, and "Francis O. Wilcox, Chief of Staff," addressed to me, and reading as follows:

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DONNELL: This will acknowledge your letter of July 22, and your request to be permitted to read the transcript of the executive proceedings of the committee on July 18 when the report of the subcommittee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 231 was discussed. I note also your statement that you intend to copy such portion of the proceedings as you deem proper and present to the Senate such of the said proceedings as you deem proper to present.

As I explained to you this morning, the committee staff is always glad to make available to Members of the Senate any records of the committee sessions they may wish to see. As you know, however, it is policy of the committee to do everything possible to maintain the integrity of its executive transcripts. In line with this policy it has been the regular practice of the staff to remind Senators who wish to read the committee records that the information contained therein is confidential or secret in nature and should be treated as such.

In view of the nature of your request, it will be necessary for me to present your letter to the committee for its consideration. I will be glad to do this at the first opportunity.

I am enclosing copies of the motions made before the committee concerning the report and the comments made by the chairman of the committee to the press following the meeting.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS C. WILCOX.

Mr. President, in addition to this letter, Dr. Wilcox handed me a sheet of paper entitled "Votes on Senate Resolution 231 in Committee on Foreign Relations, July 18, 1950," this sheet likewise being on stationery of the United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, with the names as previously indicated thereon.

Mr. President, I am not willing to reveal the contents of the copies of the motions as set forth on this sheet. Notwithstanding the assurance by Dr. Wilcox, who I know is acting in the utmost of good faith, it might nevertheless be deemed by the Senate that those contents, having been derived from the transcript, are the secret or confidential business of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I may say I do not share the view that they are, because of various facts, one of which is that the chairman of the committee issued a press release very shortly after the close of the meeting of the committee on July 18. Nevertheless, Mr. President, in view of the fact that it might be deemed by

the Senate that those contents of the motions, having been derived from the transcript, are the secret or confidential business of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall not reveal the contents of the copies of those motions to the Senate, although, as I said, Dr. Wilcox has assured me that I am not required to keep confidential the contents of the copies of those motions.

I should like to state, however, that I think that in justice both to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate, the contents of this sheet entitled "Votes on Senate Resolution 231 in Committee on Foreign Relations, July 18, 1950"—that is the way it is titled—should be made known, and I hope that the committee, or its distinguished chairman, or such person as may be authorized by the committee, will release such if any secrecy attaches to them.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to read the third item which Dr. Wilcox kindly handed to me on Saturday, July 22. It is typewritten, and contains the following on the outside cover:

Press Conference, Senate Resolution 231, Tuesday, July 18, 1950. United States Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, D. C. Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman. Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff; C. C. O'Day, clerk.

Franklin A. Steinko, stenotype reporter, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

On the first inside page the following appears:

Press conference, Tuesday, July 18, 1950. The CHAIRMAN.—

Which, of course, is the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].—

The CHAIRMAN. All right, gentlemen and ladies.

The Foreign Relations Committee met this morning and there was submitted to it the report, which you have seen, no doubt—the Tydings subcommittee report.

Mr. President, at this moment I call attention to the fact that in a few minutes it will be observed that the press conference adjourned at 12:48 p. m., and the chairman referred to the fact that the committee had met that morning. So the conference was reasonably nearly contemporaneous with the events to which the chairman of the committee refers at the press conference; and I think that clearly indicates, if not his recollection of the language used in the statements made in that committee meeting, or even if the language used at the committee meeting differed in some respects from what was said at the press conference, that at least the statements made at the press conference should give us accurately the recollection of the chairman of the committee in regard to what had transpired at the committee meeting, inasmuch as he was reporting, I judge, evidently sometime shortly after 12 o'clock noon on the same day.

I read further from the statements made by the chairman of the committee at that press conference:

It was moved in the committee that the report be received by the committee and

the subcommittee was discharged. That was the first motion, carried 11 to nothing.

I wish to emphasize the next portion of the statements made at the press conference:

Second, it was moved that the report of the subcommittee be transmitted to the Senate. That was all made in one motion, but they asked for division, so it was voted that way. That was voted 9 to 2. Everybody voted "aye" except Senator HICKENLOOPER and Senator LODGE. They voted "no."

To recur to what was previously mentioned this afternoon, let me say that the comment made by the Senator from Texas in that connection was that the committee report to the Senate. I am not undertaking to say as to that, because I have not seen the transcript, and I am not able to say whether the Senator from Wisconsin is right or wrong when he says that the Senator who made the motion, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], used the word "transmit" in making his motion, but that when the motion was stated by the chairman of the committee, the word "report" was used. I cannot assure the Senate which word was used.

However, I say that at the press conference held shortly after noon, following the morning when the committee meeting had occurred, on the occasion of that press conference the chairman of the committee obviously was giving what he thought was the meaning—whether or not the exact language used—of what had occurred at the committee meeting.

As I stated a moment ago, the chairman said:

Second, it was moved that the report of the subcommittee be transmitted to the Senate.

Mr. President, I emphasize the words "transmitted to the Senate," not with a view of saying that those were the words used either in the motion or in the way the motion was put by the chairman of the committee, or whether the Senator from Wisconsin is correct in his recollection that the Senator from Florida used the word "transmit" in making the motion, but that when the chairman of the committee put the motion, he used the word "report." I am not undertaking to say as to that. However, there was the chairman of the committee making the statement, almost contemporaneously with the event itself, that—

Second, it was moved that the report of the subcommittee be transmitted to the Senate.

Certainly it is reasonable to believe that regardless of the precise language used—whatever it may have been—the thought of the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee, in speaking to the press almost contemporaneously with the committee meeting itself, was that the meaning of the committee and the thought of the committee was that the report of the subcommittee be transmitted to the Senate.

Then the chairman of the committee proceeded at the press conference with the following statement:

That was all made in one motion, but they asked for division, so it was voted that way. That was voted nine to two. Every-

body voted aye except Senator HICKENLOOPER and Senator LODGE. They voted no. Question—

In other words, a question by some member of the press, I assume—

Did they say why?

The CHAIRMAN. I have not got an hour to tell you.

Question. Any absentee Senators?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Senator McMAHON was absent, but he had a proxy. Senator WILEY was absent, and, of course, Senator VANDENBERG is ill and was not here. That covers the absentees, I believe.

Question. Senators WILEY and VANDENBERG did not vote? There was no proxy?

The CHAIRMAN. No, they did not vote. There was no proxy. All right.

Third, it was moved that Senator HICKENLOOPER be authorized up to the 1st of August to file with the committee his individual views on the evidence adduced by the investigation and comments thereon and thereafter the committee will decide on whether to transmit it to the Senate.

Now, Senator HICKENLOOPER did not sign the report. Neither did he file a minority report. The majority report here says Senator HICKENLOOPER was told that the report was going to be made and was requested to submit his report, if he had one; he said he did not care to file minority views and that he would make his answer on the floor.

Now, on the other hand, Senator HICKENLOOPER claims that at that time he had not seen the majority report and that he could not very well make an answer to it or file his individual views, that he only got the copy at 6 o'clock last night.

Mr. President, this is the Senator from Texas still speaking to the press; and I continue to read from the statement he made to the press at that time:

Now, the vote on that motion that he be given until August 1 to file his views—that does not hold up reporting it to the Senate. We go ahead and report to the Senate the report which contains the minority views of Senator LODGE, and then Senator HICKENLOOPER has until the 1st of August to file here with this committee his individual views; and it is then up to the committee to decide whether or not the committee will transmit his individual views to the Senate.

On that motion, Senator FULBRIGHT's motion for Senator HICKENLOOPER's views by August 1, there were nine voting "aye" and Senator HICKENLOOPER voted "present" and Mr. LODGE voted "present." The others are those that are named, Senator VANDENBERG and Senator WILEY were not here, a 9-to-0 vote.

So that is the kettle of fish, gentlemen and ladies.

Question. This officially closes the investigation, then, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, yes, it closes it with the exception of our getting Senator HICKENLOOPER's report and deciding whether we will transmit it to the Senate or not. Of course, it is up to what the Senate does about closing the report. This committee is through with it when we file this report and any other matters that go up to the Senate it will then be up to the Senate to determine whether there will be any further proceedings in the matter or not.

Question. Will you have anything to recommend?

The CHAIRMAN. You haven't heard me say anything about it.

Question. No, I ask you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I haven't got anything to submit at this time. It depends on developments.

Question. Are you considering making recommendations?

The CHAIRMAN. No, not yet.

Question. Were those the only votes taken, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, those were the only ones. These are the determining votes. We chewed around on a lot of things, but this is the quintessence of our discussion.

Question. Senator, are you considering making recommendations to the Senate?

The CHAIRMAN. No, I am not yet. There are some recommendations in this report now, if you want to study that.

Let me call the attention of the Senate particularly to the next questions and answers:

Question. The committee—

Meaning the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—

neither approved nor disapproved this report, it just received it?

The CHAIRMAN. That is all. We did not go into that, because we want to go home by Christmas.

Question. Did anybody propose that you accept the report or approve the report?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the motion was to receive the report and transmit it to the Senate. So I will have to do that. I appointed Senator TYDINGS to report for this committee; he is the chairman of the subcommittee, to report to the Senate, to transmit it to the Senate.

I pause to say that clearly, judging from the answer given by the chairman of the committee in response to the question—

The committee neither approved nor disapproved this report, it just received it?

The chairman said:

That is all. We did not go into that, because we want to go home by Christmas.

I read further:

Question. Did anybody propose that you accept the report or approve the report?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the motion was to receive the report and transmit it to the Senate. So I will have to do that—

And so forth. I return now to the transcript at the point where I stopped reading it a moment ago:

Question. Senator, were there not two paragraphs deleted from the report?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; there were two. Do you want that?

Question. We have them already. Page 166, paragraph 18.

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraph 18, the first two paragraphs of subdivision 18.

Question. Was that by full committee approval?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it was unanimous. Nobody objected to that. Senator TYDINGS did not object to it, and the rest of us did not object to it. It was through an intense desire not to cast any reflections on either one of the Senators, so there was no objection to that. This is a long report, and a fellow cannot remember everything that is in it, you know, offhand.

Yes, Mr. President, I am interpolating; it was a long report, and a fellow could not be expected to remember everything that was in it, offhand.

I return to the transcript:

Question. What do you think of the report, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think it is filed, and I am going to send it to the Senate.

Question. Did you say "vile"?

The CHAIRMAN. I say it was received by the committee, and I am instructed to transmit it to the Senate.

I want to read that again.

The CHAIRMAN. I say it was received by the committee, and I am instructed to transmit it to the Senate.

Remember, this is the chairman speaking almost contemporaneously with the event itself.

I now continue with the conclusion of the distinguished Senator's press release, which is so characteristic of him that I only wish he were here to enjoy what I know we all would—his humor. He says:

When a fellow asks me a question like that it reminds me of a man making a political speech, a man from Tammany over on the East Side, and there were some rough-necks there, some tough ones, and he got up and asked if there were any questions.

Someone asked him some embarrassing questions, and his bunch of thugs just went in and grabbed this fellow, gave him a good stiff kick in the pants, and took him to the stairway and pitched him down, and he bumped and bumped and bumped and finally out on the sidewalk, and then the orator said, "Is there any other gentleman that wants to ask a question?"

Are there any other questions? [Laughter.] (Whereupon, at 12:48 p. m., the press conference adjourned.)

So, Mr. President, this is the document containing the comments of the chairman of the committee as to what transpired. I shall not trespass much longer on the time of the Senate. This afternoon—it may have been even this morning; I am not sure—the Senator from New Jersey happened to see me somewhere in or about the precincts of the Senate and informed me that action was taken in respect to my letter or my request—I do not recall his exact language to me, at this time, but at any rate, that action had been taken. Subsequently I saw the Senator from Texas enter the Chamber, and he said to me, in substance, the same thing, that action had been taken, and that I would hear from the clerk of the committee, I believe he said, or someone from the committee. I have not yet heard. I should not be surprised if Dr. Wilcox is waiting around here to tell me what happened. But suffice it to say, Mr. President, that I have not yet received permission to examine the proceedings of July 18, 1950, with the right on my part to use the information which I shall secure and to bring them to the Senate.

Personally, Mr. President, I could well make the point that it may well be as a general rule advisable to require that proceedings of executive sessions shall be given out, and yet, I call to the attention of the Presiding Officer the fact that the concluding portion of this voluminous document entitled "Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate," beginning at page 1471 and running on through to the end of the volume, page 1484—I think I am correct in saying; yes, I am—is entitled "Executive Session." And so obviously the committee itself saw no objection to giving out, in that instance, what occurred in an executive session.

Mr. President, I am not asking that the Senate Committee on Foreign Rela-

tions establish a general rule that all of its executive sessions shall be made public. I can understand how that might restrict the freedom of comment that would be made by Members in the executive sessions; I can appreciate that. But, even if it be not always, or perhaps usually advisable to make public the contents of an executive session, I submit that in this matter, of such vital importance to the Senate, yes, far more, however, to the people of the United States—where, in order to interpret correctly the meaning of the motions that were made and carried, it may not only be advisable, but it may be necessary to know the contents of the transcript. If there are some remarks here or there which the committee deems improper to make public, if someone has made an unwise remark or a hasty remark or an intemperate remark, I am sure there is no Senator who would desire to breach the proprieties by using such excerpts. But what I want to find out, and what the Senate wants to know, at least what some of us want to know, and I hope the Senate wants to know, is whether this document which was filed here and sent to us as a report adopted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or was merely the transmittal of a report of a subcommittee, particularly when I find in the press conference of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee occurring almost contemporaneously with the acts, the statement, in the questions and answers that the committee neither approved nor disapproved the report and that he had just received it. Then the chairman said:

That is all. We did not go into that, because we want to go home by Christmas.

Question. Did anybody propose that you accept the report or approve the report?

The CHAIRMAN. No, the motion was to receive the report and transmit it to the Senate. So I will have to do that.

Then the distinguished Senator says further on in the press conference:

I say it was received by the committee and I am instructed to transmit it to the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I say there is no evidence so far as I can see in that transcript, nor, indeed, do I see any tangible evidence of any real moment or consequence, or certainly any conclusive evidence, if it be real or consequential, to the effect that the committee intended to approve this report.

Here we have the members of the committee, in the testimony I have recited, indicating too clearly even to raise the question, that they were not approving this report. The Senator from New Jersey, making the statements which I have quoted, to the general effect that—

I distinctly understood that it was not a report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I doubt that anyone except the chairman of the subcommittee had read the report. I do not know that anybody else ever had a chance to read it. There was no discussion of its merits (etc., etc.).

The statements by the Senator from Iowa, coupled with the statements of

the Senator from Texas when he gives out in his press conference his understanding, indicate certainly, to put it negatively, that there is substantial doubt as to whether this was ever adopted by the committee. And I am going to put it more affirmatively: I say there is no conclusive—yes, but little, if any, persuasive—evidence to the effect that it was adopted by the committee.

It seems to me that what happened was, just as the Senator from Texas in his press conference indicates, that the document was received by the committee, and he was instructed to transmit it to the Senate. That, to my mind, does not constitute the adoption, the thoughtful, the careful deliberation that should always characterize the adoption of a report by a great committee such as the Committee on Foreign Relations, dealing with a subject of such vital moment as this subject which was committed to it and, through it, to its subcommittee. Certainly the Committee on Foreign Relations could not be expected to come together, and, without reading the report, with only a short consideration of it, without proper deliberation, adopt it.

Mr. President, I now come to the end, in these concluding sentences, to the question which I asked, which was, Is it proper that Report No. 2108, Eighty-first Congress, second session, be circulated with its cover page containing the words "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations"?

The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has submitted a resolution setting forth that it does not appear that the Foreign Relations Committee has adopted the report. The resolution recites, in one of its whereases:

A false impression of the status of this report will be spread abroad by the cover which has been substituted since it has been received by this body.

He takes the view, to quote his resolution—

that said report should be at once withdrawn from distribution until the cover be replaced—

Namely, the cover which recited that the report was the report of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I say this, in answer to the question which I propounded and about which I have endeavored to address myself this afternoon, that until all doubt that the report is the report of the full committee shall have been removed, the report should not be circulated as the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I most earnestly submit that the doubt to which I refer cannot be removed until the transcript of the proceedings of the committee on July 18, 1950, shall have been made available to the Senate free of restriction.

Mr. DONNELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks on the report on Senate Report 2108, made today, there be set forth a letter received subsequently by me today from Dr. Francis O. Wilcox.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
July 25, 1950.

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DONNELL: The Senate Foreign Relations Committee met this morning, and among other things, considered your request of July 22 relating to the transcript of the executive proceedings of the committee for July 18. Your letter of July 22 and my reply of the same date were read into the record. The committee approved the following motion without a dissenting vote.

"That Senator DONNELL be permitted to read the transcript of the executive session of the committee held July 18, 1950, on the same confidential basis as all members of the committee."

It is my understanding that the chairman of the committee and Senator SMITH of New Jersey have already spoken to you about the action taken by the committee. If you wish to examine the records of the committee for July 18, or the proceedings relating to other executive sessions, please do not hesitate to let me know. We on the committee staff are anxious to do what we can to help the Members of the Senate in their consideration of problems in the field of foreign affairs.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS O. WILCOX.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED
BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1027. An act for the relief of the Merit Co.:

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades;

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Tevfik Kamil Kutay;

S. 2864. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; and

S. 3937. An act to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT
RELATING TO APPROPRIATION
BILL

During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL's speech,

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Missouri and the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senate proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill for a period of 2 hours, the debate to be limited to 10 minutes for each Senator, and that debate must be germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I did not hear the unanimous-consent request, Mr. President, and I should like very much to know what it is.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is that after the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Missouri and the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the pending measure, the appropriation bill, for a period of 2 hours, and that the debate be limited to 10 minutes for each Senator, and that it must be germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I was endeavoring to work out a unanimous-consent agreement with the acting majority leader, but I did not know that the Senate would continue for 2 hours. Does that mean that we shall wait until approximately 6 o'clock before the Senators have concluded their remarks?

Mr. McFARLAND. Let us get in at least 2 hours on the appropriation bill. I think we can take a recess a little after 6:30 o'clock. I do not know how long the Senator from Michigan will speak. I beg of the Senator from Nebraska not to object to spending 2 hours on the appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator from Missouri permit me to ask him how long his speech will take?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; I am perfectly willing that the Senator may do so. I should like to say that yesterday I thought 30 minutes would be sufficient, but it will not be sufficient. I shall take in the neighborhood of 25 minutes more. My judgment is that I shall require 25 or 30 minutes, but I do not promise to limit my remarks to a specific length of time.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to working out an agreement with the able acting majority leader. I should like to ask him if he will modify his request to give consideration to the appropriation bill from the time the Senator from Michigan concludes until 7 o'clock. That would give Senators a chance to either get their dinners at home or in the restaurant downstairs.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I will modify my request accordingly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, some Senators who are interested in this subject have asked that a quorum call be had before we enter into any such agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope the Senator will not suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I did not yield for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona, as modified?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not wish to object, but I should like to understand whether the agreement is limited to the time remaining today. As I understand it, it does not refer to any time tomorrow, for example.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is limited to 2 hours, and not to go beyond 7 o'clock today.

Mr. MURRAY. It does not apply to future consideration of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we have a quorum call first, I have no objection. Otherwise, I must object.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not yield for a quorum call. I do not yield, Mr. President.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist on a quorum call. Previously only one Senator had objected to an agreement, and he has since then withdrawn his objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, I promised several Senators that I would have a quorum call.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator kindly consult them first?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot do that at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall renew my request later. Will the Senator consult them and inform me later?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] be permitted to complete the brief remarks he wishes to make, which I understand will take about 2 minutes, and that then the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

May I ask the Senator from Nevada if that is a sufficient time?

Mr. MALONE. Reserving the right to object, I said "about 10 minutes." I would not want to be held down to a half-minute more than that. Let us make it whatever time it takes—approximately 10 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to complete my unanimous-consent request. I ask that thereafter the Senate proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill for a period of 2 hours, and that debate on the amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes to each Senator, and that all remarks must be germane to the amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object to the agreement, but I object to the request in the absence of a quorum, because I think other Members of the Senate are entitled to have a quorum present. My agreement to the request will be dependent upon what I think is a very good rule or custom of the Senate, namely, to first have a quorum present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator will permit the unanimous-consent request to go through. Then we shall have more Senators present when the appropriation bill is being considered.

Mr. MORSE. The difficulty with that, Mr. President, is that my suggestion of the absence of a quorum is to assure Senators of an opportunity to be heard if they want to object to the unanimous-consent request.

I think there should be a quorum call in advance of any such agreement. I would expect that if I were off the floor. I have had discussions in the past with the minority leader regarding the same point. I think the same courtesy should be extended to other Senators. Therefore I object to the request, unless there

is a quorum call. Then I shall have no objection to it.

ALERTING THE NATION TO INTERNAL THREATS FROM THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last night the President issued a statement calling upon all law-enforcement officers, patriotic organizations, and private citizens to report all information relating to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities to the nearest office of the FBI.

With American forces fighting a warlike operation against Communists in Korea, and in view of the fact that communism is an international conspiracy using espionage, sabotage, and subversion as weapons of war, there certainly is a "clear and present danger" to the country which demands the utmost vigilance. I believe the President is justified in alerting the Nation to these internal threats from the Communist movement.

Mr. President, in order that the Senate may not be further delayed, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

The statement by Mr. FERGUSON follows:

With the President calling upon every citizen to report information to the FBI, there is a strong possibility that an impossible workload may be saddled on that agency to investigate rumors, spite tip-offs, and similarly motivated information passed on to the authorities by citizens untrained in recognizing true subversion.

Nevertheless, in the face of clear and present danger in which the country now finds itself I do not condemn the alerting of our people—even in the extreme fashion suggested by the President.

But what I want to know is why the President and his administration do not themselves apply proper methods for reaching subversive activities before going to less effective extremes? Even while the President was making his announcement, Communist subversives were and still are at work in their familiar attempts to use a front device to undermine the morale of unsuspecting Americans who ought to be firm in our resolve to support the sacrifices we are making in Korea. I speak of the peace-mobilization petitions which the worker bees of the Communist conspiracy are circulating throughout this country. We know these petitions originated with the peace partisans sponsored in Moscow. We know these petitions at a time like this are instruments of psychological warfare in the Communist conspiracy to dominate the world. They are intended to soften up our home population, to create divisions among our people, and to implant the idea in their minds that while Russia seeks peace, America looks to war. This is a gross distortion of the truth, and most informed people know it; but nevertheless thousands of people are signing these petitions because they are misled by this Communist phony peace front.

This is a perfect example of how the President and this administration remain blind to the true nature of subversive activities and how to reach the heart of it. Even while the Executive is looking for reports of intended sabotage from untrained private citizens, this phony peace mobilization is eating at the basic morale of the country and nothing the administration is doing has stopped that form of subversion. It still allows innocent people to be taken in by these fronts.

Yet it turns a deaf ear to a proper and legal way to go to the root of Communist subversion in this country. We have tried again and again in Congress to get the administration to consider Senate bill 2311 which is the Mundt-Ferguson bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities. Yet the administration leaders in Congress, as well as the executive department, resist the passage of this needed legislation with the same fierce determination they have shown in every exposure of subversion.

The Justice Department explains that Communist subversives will be difficult to expose because they are citizens of the country rather than aliens who can be easily rounded up. Existing laws are inadequate to deal with an insidious movement such as Communist subversion. Federal law enforcement officers have testified to that effect time and again. The fact that we have had to get at espionage and subversion by the backhanded methods of "perjury" as in the Hiss, Coplon, Marzani, and Remington cases, is ample proof that we do not have laws adequate to protect us directly from subversive operations.

The main difficulty all the way through is that we have no workable standards of determining what subversive activity is and we have no workable means of identifying subversives and the false fronts by which they deceive our people. The correction of these defects in our laws is the heart of the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill to protect our people. The bill is aimed to bring professional instigators of espionage, sabotage, and subversion out into the open and to make it impossible for them to recruit innocent people and to gain financial resources to carry on their destructive propaganda.

Mr. President, this is not the time to explain the detailed provisions of this bill. But the President's statement last night alerting the country against subversives and saboteurs shows that it is high time that the administration give immediate attention to proper ways to get at this menace to our people and our institutions. Recent history has always been a step ahead of this administration. We were surprised at Pearl Harbor. Our position in the Far East was foreclosed by Communist China. We were taken off guard at Berlin. Now it is Korea. When does this administration propose to wake up and anticipate developments? Must we always be the victims of hostile actions before we prepare ourselves? Today, guerrilla forces are making many of our positions in Korea intolerable and causing untold loss of lives to American boys sent to that area. Yesterday, those guerrilla forces were Communist subversives in South Korea undermining the country in preparation for the hot war. Are we to wait here at home until our people are divided and our morale broken before we adopt proper and adequate methods to deal with this new form of war behind the lines?

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the people's answer to the President's alert will be: "Yes, Mr. President, we shall report all information we have of subversive activities, but meanwhile let us have some protection in law to identify the menace we are looking for and to bring it out in the open." This is what the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill (S. 2311) does and it should be immediately considered and passed at this time of clear and present danger.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is quite apropos of what the Senator has been saying to read a telegram which I have

just now received. It is signed by Harry Lundeborg, secretary-treasurer of the Sailors Union of the Pacific, and president of the Seafarers International Union of North America. It is addressed to me and is dated July 25. It reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., July 25, 1950.
Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our country is in an all-out fight to stop the Communist aggressors in Korea and elsewhere in the world. Our Government has called on all Americans to stand by and aid their country in this crisis. American boys are being killed daily in Korea fighting for the principles of our great country. On the home front the tools of Joe Stalin are doing business as usual, because of the wishy-washy attitude of various Government bureaus. Commies and fellow travelers are still being allowed to sail freely. Some of these weak-kneed shipowners and union and Government bureaus do not seem to have the guts to eliminate these Commie saboteurs from the American ships and waterfront. Within the past 10 days one of the American President Lines ships, which by the way is Government-owned, carrying troops and vital war material for the fighting front in the Orient left San Francisco with 7 men aboard who had been declared bad security risks by the United States Navy Intelligence. No effort was made to take these crumbs off the ship. What we would like to know is how long is the United States Government going to allow this condition to exist? The members of our organization in a meeting last night in San Francisco with over a thousand men assembled went unanimously on record to notify the proper authorities in Washington, D. C., that if these Commie saboteurs are not eliminated from American ships and waterfronts that we will be forced to refuse to sail the ships in order to protect ourselves. It is up to the United States Government. Do they want loyal American seamen on their ships or do they want Joe Stalin's American stooges? We request your cooperation in exposing and correcting this dangerous condition.

HARRY LUNDEBERG,
Secretary-Treasurer, Sailors Union of
the Pacific; President, Seafarers
International Union of North
America.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's reading the telegram into the RECORD, because it is most timely and it tells the public very forcibly what is going on. There is a remedy. The question is asked, "How long shall we wait?" We would not be waiting until now if action had been taken on S. 2311.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall yield, but I am trying to limit my remarks at this point so that we may proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator has been a judge, and a very able one, and his thoughts on this subject should be put into the RECORD. In the light of the President's request that people notify the Bureau of any evidence that they may have of subversives, I should like to ask a question. In view of the reasoning being followed by the loyalty board and by the Tydings-McMahon committee, that regardless of how much positive evidence is presented that a man is a member of the Communist Party or an espionage agent, if one does not see him light the fuse, and if witnesses can be

found to testify, "We did not see him light the fuse, and we do not know if he is a member of the party," does the Senator think it will do any good merely to give the information to the FBI, unless we have a complete about face by the loyalty board or get a new board composed of people who know something about law.

Mr. FERGUSON. I can answer the Senator's question in this way. The courts for years have considered that positive evidence is stronger than negative evidence. Therefore the loyalty board as a court should consider positive evidence to be stronger than negative evidence.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may ask another question: Does he agree with me that it would be impossible to ever get rid of any Communist or espionage agent if he is to be cleared merely by making a search and finding people who are willing to say, "I do not know that he is a Communist"?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I had in mind when I referred to negative evidence. It is the credibility of the witnesses and the knowledge that they have of the particular subject. I yield the floor.

EIGHT BILLION DOLLARS WITHOUT RAISING TAXES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada is pointing out today a way to find an additional four billion dollars for the military fund. This is in addition to the four billion dollars pointed out yesterday. This makes eight billion dollars, which is a good start on our expanded military program and which is available without raising the tax rates.

MILITARY FUNDS FROM CONGRESS—NO PROBLEM—\$90,000,000,000 SINCE WORLD WAR II

Mr. President, the appropriation of funds necessary for national defense has never been a problem in the Congress, as witnessed by the approximately \$90,000,000,000 which have been appropriated for military purposes since the close of World War II.

TAXPAYER LEAST REGARDED

The junior Senator from Nevada is shocked by the lack of interest in Washington in the plight of the American taxpayer. Members of this body talk glibly of passing taxes onto the already overburdened American workers, the great majority of whom are struggling to buy the necessities of life after paying already high taxes.

Washington does not seem to know this. Perhaps it is a secret from Washington residents.

We are asked for approximately \$10,500,000,000 for an expanded military program because we are at war.

WAR MONEY WILL BE RAISED

Of course this money must be made available and it will be made available. To the certain knowledge of the junior Senator from Nevada an appropriation asked for by the President for military purposes has never been turned down by the Congress of the United States since the junior Senator from Nevada has been a Member of the Senate.

START DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Has the administration suggested tightening its own belt? Has the administration offered to curtail any of its peacetime expenditures in order to make up any of the \$10,500,000,000? Spend, spend, spend, save nothing, boost the withholding taxes, give no thought to the American taxpayer seems to be the only program understood in Washington.

INDIRECT TAXES—HITS EVERYBODY

Mr. President, every citizen is a substantial taxpayer, directly or indirectly, whether he realizes it or not. That is evidenced by the more than 50 indirect taxes on a loaf of bread. A 17-cent loaf of bread should cost not more than 7 cents if it were not for the indirect taxes.

CORPORATIONS INDIRECT TAX-COLLECTING AGENCIES

Mr. President, for many years the Congress of the United States had used the corporations as tax-collection agencies. The corporations have simply transferred such taxes to their product, the sale of which makes up the taxes to go into the United States Treasury. The people who buy the product, whether it be bread, a suit of clothes, a woman's hat, or any other product, pay the taxes. For a long time the folks were fooled. I doubt that they are fooled now.

Are the Members of this body interested in saving any money for the taxpayers in their respective States? If so, the junior Senator from Nevada has some suggestions to make. These suggestions are intended only for those who want taxes to be no higher than necessary and who abhor wasting other people's money.

FOUR BILLION DOLLARS ECA AND UNIFICATION—20 PERCENT REDUCTION IN DOMESTIC BUDGET

The \$4,000,000,000 mentioned yesterday can be found by stopping ECA, a peacetime endeavor, and by unifying our military assistance program with our own military program. What was said in yesterday's debate is not going to be repeated. We shall go on to the additional \$4,000,000,000.

Three billion dollars has been made available for the peacetime expansion of industry in the 16 European countries, which is already overexpanded for peacetime production. Consequently, it was found that these countries must sell their peacetime products in our country and thus displace our own workmen. The \$3,000,000,000 could be transferred immediately. The appropriation has been made. What is the reason, then, that it must be expended in wartime on an already overexpanded peacetime industry? The \$3,000,000,000 additional should be made available immediately for national defense.

First I should like to read into the RECORD a brief excerpt from an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Times-Herald. It referred to the appropriation of approximately \$3,000,000,000 to build up the European countries' civilian peacetime economy and went on to say:

Considering the lack of response from these countries when the United Nations

asked for troops to help our foot soldiers in Korea, it would be a good thing if we stopped some of our dollars from going abroad next year.

There is no valid reason for putting the people in this country on a wartime basis and still keep gouging them to build up peacetime economy in Europe. We will do enough along this line when we begin spending the ten billions for military purposes. We will increase our imports of tin, rubber, and so forth, and they will get the profits. And beyond that we may expect the administration to siphon off some of the goods as well to increase European munitions production.

Therefore, we urge that the civilian foreign aid be cut to a liquidation figure.

Mr. President, in the new appropriation bill there is an item of \$500,000,000 for peacetime public works. In wartime such works are unnecessary, and, in fact, undesirable. Our money and our man-hours should be devoted to the war effort. This \$500,000,000 should be transferred to the military program, except, of course, a relatively minor amount retained for emergency works.

The new budget is approximately \$42,000,000,000; \$13,500,000,000 is for the military; \$6,000,000,000 for veteran services and benefits; \$5,500,000,000 for interest on the public debt; and \$17,000,000,000 for the civil government, exclusive of the items mentioned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the exact figures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Budget, July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951

Requested for—

National defense.....	\$13,545,000,000
Veterans' services and benefits.....	6,080,000,000
Interest on public debt.....	5,625,000,000
Remaining.....	17,189,000,000
Total.....	42,439,000,000

Mr. MALONE. Now, Mr. President, I wish to quote from the same editorial, as follows:

Last December, Senator BYRD made a proposal to save \$5,200,000,000 by cutting back Government domestic expenditures to the 1948 level.

BYRD's plan excluded any reductions in defense or any lessening of stockpiling atomic energy, veterans' aid, foreign aid, or interest on the public debt.

The Virginia Senator picked 1948 as a base because it was the soundest postwar year. The budget was balanced in 1948, Government expenditures were trimmed, and taxes were cut.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOMESTIC PROGRAM

In 1948, the Federal Government spent the \$6,400,000,000 on its domestic program. When the distinguished Senator from Virginia recommended his plan, the country was not proceeding into a wartime economy as it is now, it was looking forward to another year in which the Government would be geared to peacetime operations. Now, with the abrupt change to wartime operations, it might be considered logical to make even deeper domestic cuts than those suggested by the distinguished Senator from Virginia. However, in order to

raise the necessary funds, we need not go even as far as then suggested. The junior Senator from Nevada proposes that we save 20 percent of the seventeen billion for civil government. That would be approximately three and a half billions saved.

EIGHT BILLION DOLLARS OUT OF THE TEN BILLION DOLLARS REQUESTED AVAILABLE

Add this three and one-half billion to the half billion saved from peacetime public works and the four billions mentioned yesterday, which we can save by stopping ECA, and by unifying our military programs, and we have eight billions for the new military program.

Under this plan, Mr. President, we need not load down our taxpayers with additional burdens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the complete editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald of this morning.

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

How To Save \$10,000,000,000

Here is a way for Congress to find that \$10,000,000,000 Mr. Truman is asking as a down payment on the cost the Nation is called on to pay for the administration's bonehead operations in Korea and elsewhere.

This plan does not call for added taxes. It calls for less costly civil government, and it is not dream stuff. Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, is the draftsman of its principles.

Senator BYRD is known from one end of the country to the other as a practical authority on government. If he says a thing can be done, it can be done.

Therefore, we offer this program for consideration in full confidence that any citizen can support it who sincerely wants the United States pulled safely through the misadventures of the Truman gang without the destruction of our domestic life.

Last December, Senator BYRD made a proposal to save \$5,200,000,000 by cutting back Government domestic expenditures to the 1948 level.

BYRD's plan excluded any reductions in defense or any lessening of stockpiling atomic energy, veterans' aid, foreign aid, or interest on the public debt.

The Virginia Senator picked 1948 as a base because it was the soundest postwar year. The budget was balanced in 1948, Government expenditures were trimmed, and taxes were cut.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS ECONOMICAL

It's also worthy of note that the Republican Eightieth Congress was in power that year and received as its reward for work well done a scathing attack from Truman, who called it the "worst Congress" in our history.

In 1948 the Federal Government spent \$6,400,000,000 on its domestic programs. In the 1951 budget Truman has asked Congress to give him \$11,600,000,000 for the same programs, therefore a return to the 1948 budget would result in the \$5,200,000,000 savings.

However, when Senator BYRD recommended this plan the country was not proceeding into a wartime economy as it is now. It was looking forward to another year in which the Government would be geared to peacetime operations. Now with the abrupt change to wartime operations it is only logical that we follow up Senator BYRD's basic program with even further cuts from the 1948 budget he proposed.

For example, there were \$200,000,000 in that 1948 budget for work relief. Certainly our increased production demands will wipe out need for any such expenditures. In that budget there were also \$100,000,000 for housing. The President in his message recommended knocking out all housing money. There were also in that 1948 budget, \$500,000,000 for peacetime public works. In wartime such are unnecessary and undesirable.

That budget also carried \$30,000,000 for agriculture support. That can't be justified. Another item on which the saving can be made is the \$300,000,000 postal deficit which should be wiped out immediately, regardless of whether we are to operate a peacetime or wartime economy. The Hoover reorganization report gives a full blueprint on how to accomplish this.

If these cuts were made it would bring the savings to \$6,300,000,000.

FOREIGN AID CAN BE CUT

Although BYRD did not recommend slashing the veterans' program for his peacetime budget it appears that there is sufficient room in the six billions asked by Truman in the 1951 budget to save at least 25 percent or \$700,000,000. In that 1951 request, for example, there are \$2,700,000,000 for the veterans' readjustment program. Certainly there will be a considerable cut in such activities as we build up the armed services.

Thus, the domestic cuts would save seven billion.

And we think that since America must tighten its belt again it would be a good time to look at the foreign-aid program for immediate relief. Since the war we have set up approximately 23 foreign-aid programs into which we have poured \$35,000,000,000.

The 1950 budget carries three and seven-tenths billions to build up Europe's civilian economy over and above the military aid we are giving.

Considering the lack of response from these countries when the United Nations asked for troops to help our foot soldiers in Korea, it would be a good thing if we stopped some of our dollars from going abroad next year.

There is no valid reason for putting the people in this country on a wartime basis and still keep gouging them to build up peacetime economy in Europe. We will do enough along this line when we begin spending the ten billions for military purposes. We will increase our imports of tin, rubber, etc., and they will get the profits. And beyond that we may expect the administration to siphon off some of the goods as well to increase European munitions production.

Therefore, we urge that the civilian foreign aid be cut to a liquidation figure of \$700,000,000. The three billion cut on this item will then bring the total saving to ten billions. This bill produces a complete set-off to the ten billions to be spent.

To us it seems that economy is a much sounder method of meeting the increased military costs than burdening the American people with more taxes and more Government controls.

TIME TO TAKE STOCK

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is time for the Congress of the United States to take stock. It is time to gather the loose ends of this Government together, furnish the requested national defense fund of ten and one-half billion, but use the available funds before raising taxes.

All will agree that the Congress has been liberal with appropriations for national defense, the appropriations having amounted to \$89,124,000,000 since the close of World War II.

The junior Senator from Nevada has suggested the source of eight billion,

available to be applied on the ten and one-half billion needed at this time, according to the President's request. Additional funds are available from other sources.

The junior Senator from Nevada will have more to say about this subject later.

THE WAR IN KOREA—OBLIGATION OF ALL MEMBERS OF UNITED NATIONS TO FURNISH TROOPS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, my remarks this afternoon will be very brief.

The United Nations are in a war to win. We will win. In fact, we will win even if the United States has to do the job with its own ground troops alone. Of that, there can be no doubt.

Republicans are giving this administration full support in the Korean crisis. However, the time has come for this country to be realistic.

The United States has not unlimited manpower. We are willing to furnish more than our share of arms and munitions of war in this fight to halt communism. We are willing to furnish our share of men, but I am convinced that this administration has not done all it can to secure the cooperation of the other United Nations in furnishing their share of manpower.

England, Australia, France, the Philippines, and other countries have large numbers of able-bodied young men who should be trained right now to take their places alongside our valiant soldiers on the Korean front. It is not just or prudent for this Nation to bear the whole brunt of the Communist onslaught. I urge the administration to call immediately an emergency meeting of the Security Council to discuss means of training their young men forthwith to do their share of the fighting in Korea, and thus make more modest inroads in our supply of reservists and the use of Americans.

Trygve Lie's appeal to the United Nations for support should be followed by vigorous action on the part of the administration to translate the general desires and pious hopes into concrete results in the way of infantry troops and antitank battalions of all nations.

Let us make this in fact the fight of all the free world in the United Nations against communism.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Atomic Energy Commission," on page 287, line 1, to strike out the following proviso:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost plus a fixed fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where the fee for community management is at a rate in excess of \$90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a

transportation system where the fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 287, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$80,000," and on page 288, line 4, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$15,261,913" and insert "\$15,761,913."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion," on page 291, line 5, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Displaced Persons Commission," on page 291, after line 109, to strike out:

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (Public Law 774, approved June 25, 1948), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$455,100: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreement with governmental and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section

15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$9,000,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with international, governmental, and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission," on page 295, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$247,500" and insert "\$256,500", and in line 16, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "\$3,938,300" and insert "\$4,013,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 296, line 10, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "\$3,866,695" and insert "\$3,916,695", and in line 11, after the word "available", to strike out "to the Bureau of Trade Practice Conferences."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office," on page 296, line 21, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$34,500,000" and insert "\$32,689,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 297, line 3, after "(28 U. S. C. 2672)", to insert "for newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding \$600)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Services Administration," on page 297, line 15, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$22,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 300, line 17, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$633,608,240" and insert "\$605,000,000"; in line 19, after the word "expended", to strike out "of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of said act of July 23, 1946, through purchase contracts negotiated with operators within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and in making advance payments on such contracts to the extent determined to be necessary to the performance thereof, and"; and on page 301, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$125,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 302, line 24, after the word "vehicles", to insert a semicolon and "and in addition, the General Services Administration is

authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000 for the purposes of this appropriation"; and on page 303, line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure on any project until a certificate has been received from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 303, line 12, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert "\$27,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 304, line 2, after "(62 Stat. 1155)", to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 304, line 12, after the word "books", to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$52,285."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 304, line 15, after "(58 Stat. 827)", to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 307, line 12, after the word "War", to strike out "\$76,500,000" and insert "\$82,725,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 309, after line 6, to strike out:

During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 309, after line 17, to strike out:

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government (which shall include all departments, independent establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations) shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines (except typewriting machines for veterans under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) unless the Administrator of General Services certifies that he is unable to furnish such agency with suitable typewriting machines out of stock on hand. The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed at such times as he may determine to be necessary to survey and determine the numbers and kinds of typewriting machines located in the continental limits of the United States which are at any time surplus to the requirements of any agency in the executive branch of the Government (which shall include all departments, independent establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations). Upon such determina-

tion the Administrator of General Services is authorized to direct, upon such notice and in such manner as he may prescribe, the head of any such agency to surrender to the General Services Administration any and all typewriting machines surplus to its requirements, the costs of packing, shipping, and handling thereof to be charged to the general supply fund. Each such agency shall furnish the Administrator of General Services such information regarding typewriting machines, wherever located, as he may from time to time request. The General Services Administration is authorized and directed to receive, hold, sell, exchange, or supply to any branch of the Government, including the District of Columbia, typewriting machines surrendered to it hereunder. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to charge each agency to which typewriting machines are supplied hereunder amounts equal to the fair value thereof, as determined by him, and such amounts shall be credited to the general supply fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 311, line 22, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "\$4,200,000" and insert "\$4,900,000"; and on page 312, line 3, after the word "amended", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That necessary expenses of inspections of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be compensated by such institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative, and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Housing Administration," on page 312, line 20, after "(42 U. S. C. 1410)", to strike out "\$7,500,000" and insert "\$9,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 313, line 15, after the word "Administration", to strike out "\$8,750,000" and insert "\$11,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 314, line 13, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$9,889,600" and insert "\$10,002,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 315, line 10, after "(28 U. S. C. 2672)", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,016,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 315, line 19, after "(28 U. S. C. 2672)", to strike out "\$700,000" and insert "\$718,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Motor Carrier Claims Commission—Salaries and expenses," on page 316, line 12, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to

strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$227,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 317, line 4, after the word "all", to strike out "\$40,890,630" and insert "\$44,225,630", and in line 11, after the word "reimbursement", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the operation of a field office outside the continental or territorial limits of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 317, line 24, after the word "of", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$12,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Housing Authority," on page 318, line 5, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$39,600", and in line 7, after the word "monthly", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, 81st Cong.) shall not be effective.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Philippine War Damage Commission," on page 320, line 18, after the word "Philippines", to insert "or, in the absence of such finding by such court, the Commission after hearing finds upon evidence that such person was guilty of such collaboration or act of disloyalty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 321, line 11, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$6,130,000" and insert "\$6,330,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution," on page 322, line 20, after the word "publications", to strike out "\$2,606,490" and insert "\$2,770,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 322, after line 20, to insert:

Paleontological investigations: For payments to non-Federal agencies for cooperative paleontological investigations in accordance with the act of August 15, 1949 (Pub. Law 228), to remain available until expended, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 323, line 25, after the word "proper", to strike out "\$1,153,000" and insert "\$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to go back for a moment to page 282 under the heading "Independent Offices," the item "American Battle Monuments Commission." I am satisfied that I know the answer to the question which I want to put to the chairman of the subcommittee, but I should like to make it a matter of record at the present time. My question is this: Is there anything in the section starting on page 282

dealing with the American Battle Monuments Commission that would in any way limit any agency of Government which has jurisdiction over existing battle monuments and battlefields to continue to maintain the battlefield at Balls Bluff, near Leesburg, Va.?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the operations under this appropriation are primarily those which are carried on as the result of World War No. 2. The cemetery to which the Senator refers is, I think, the subject of a bill which was introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, earlier in the year, and which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and is now on the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. What does it provide?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It provides for the elimination of certain cemeteries and the extension of others.

Mr. MORSE. Is there anything in this appropriation which would give the Government officials who have jurisdiction over the battlefield at Balls Bluff an excuse for not continuing to maintain that battlefield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no, there is nothing in this bill that would.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wanted to know that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The question the Senator from Oregon raises is wholly a question of legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to take a minute—half a minute, really, to state my position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the bill which was reported favorably on Monday by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and it is possible that when that is reached upon the call of the calendar the Senator may wish to discuss it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall discuss it for half a minute now. I hope the bill which was reported by the Senator's committee does not provide for the elimination of the battlefield at Balls Bluff, because if it does the Senator from Oregon will oppose it. He is sure that he will have support from very high Government officials outside the Senate. The battlefield of Balls Bluff happens to be the battlefield in which Oliver Wendell Holmes was first wounded in the Civil War, and it happens to be the battlefield on which Senator Baker, of Oregon, lost his life.

It is a very small battlefield, involving almost a nominal sum for support. I think it would be most unfortunate if the few hundred dollars it takes a year to maintain that great historic monument cannot be supplied by the Congress of the United States. I wish to make the Record now because, while information was given to me privately that this bill did not cover it, yet having found myself in controversy with some of the Government agencies over that battlefield, I wanted the Record to be perfectly clear that they could not hide behind any action we take this afternoon in the matter of continuing to maintain the Balls Bluff battlefield as a historic monument.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that there is nothing in the world in the bill that affects that battlefield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission," on page 324, line 8, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)" to strike out "\$1,290,700" and insert "\$1,340,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Tax Court of the United States," on page 325, line 4, after the word "services", to strike out "\$820,000" and insert "\$826,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission," on page 325, line 17, after the figures "\$63,000,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year, nor to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates" and in lieu thereof to insert "Provided, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless, in either case, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 326, line 24, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$26,450,000" and insert "\$30,108,000", and on page 328, line 11, after the word "contracts", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating differential subsidy for any num-

ber of ships in excess of the number of ships which are entitled to receive an operating differential subsidy pursuant to provisions of any contract, authorization, commitment or obligation by the Commission in existence on January 1, 1950, including within said limitation as to number any ships being constructed or contracted for on said date under a construction-differential subsidy contract and including also any ships the operation of which may be authorized by the Commission under any contracts which may result from any formal applications filed with the Commission prior to January 1, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 330, after line 2, to strike out:

Maritime training: For training personnel for the manning of merchant marine (including operation of training stations at Kings Point, N. Y.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Alameda, Calif., and the United States Maritime Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,229,300 for administrative personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered the Commission; \$3,342,660, including uniforms and textbooks for cadet midshipmen, to be provided in kind at an average yearly cost of not to exceed \$200 per cadet: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for compensation or allowances for trainees or cadets.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

Maritime training: For training personnel for the manning of the merchant marine (including operation of training stations at Kings Point, N. Y.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Alameda, Calif., and the United States Maritime Service Institute), including not to exceed \$2,477,000 for administrative personal services (exclusive of pay of cadet midshipmen and other trainees) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in his discretion; not to exceed \$77,000 for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered the Commission; \$3,930,520, including the pay of cadet midshipmen and other trainees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer. I am not sure of the page on which it comes, and I do not want action to be taken at the point at which my amendment should be offered. The amendment is at the desk and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 331, line 3, after the word "elsewhere" it is proposed to insert "which may be used to provide pay and allowances for personnel of the United States Maritime Service comparable to those of the Coast Guard as authorized by law (46 U. S. C. 1126, 14 F. R. 7707)".

On page 331, line 10, it is proposed to strike out \$3,930,520 and insert \$4,348,520.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is an amendment which I have discussed with the senior Senator from Wyoming. It relates to the pay of the officers and personnel of the Maritime Training School. As I understand, these men have always been paid by law on the same basis as the Coast Guard is paid. The Coast Guard received an increase in pay by the act passed a year ago. By mistake in the committee the act did not include the same raise in pay for the maritime officers and men who are at this training school. Provision was made for pay for the cadets but the amount appropriated was not sufficient to cover an increase. If my amendment is not adopted, these men will have a decrease in their present pay rather than the increase to which they are entitled.

I believe the Senator from Wyoming is thoroughly informed with the situation and is in accord with the amendment I have just offered, but I should prefer to have him speak for himself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think I should say for the RECORD that the committee in its search for ways and means of reducing the appropriation to the lowest efficient amount cut \$418,000 from the appropriation for maritime training in the belief that the officers to whom the Senator from Massachusetts has referred were not entitled to the increase in pay which was granted to them by the administrative action of the Maritime Commission at the beginning of the year. We checked the pay-increase law of last year and found that it did not deal specifically with this group.

Later, however, after the committee had acted upon the measure, my attention was called by the Senator from Massachusetts and by others to the fact that the law establishing this organization specifically provides that the officers in maritime training shall receive the pay which is provided for Coast Guard officers in similar grades. So it would be legislation for us to cut out the appropriation, and I have no objection to the Senator's amendment.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator consider it legislation if the amendment is allowed to be acted upon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it would be legislation to attempt to cut it out, that is, to change the law which provides that the men in question shall receive the same pay as the others.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as the law provides that they shall receive the same pay as the officers of the Coast Guard, I think there is nothing we can do about it on an appropriation bill.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire if the officers assigned to the maritime training schools are employed on the same basis as the officers of the Coast Guard? In other words, are they officers who have enlisted for a period of years or are they

employed as instructors, as college and high school instructors are employed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are employed on the same basis as other officers in the Coast Guard. That is true of the men also.

Mr. AIKEN. And they enlist for a period of years?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I simply wish to say that I believe the committee amendment is very definitely a proposal in the national defense. One of the largest of the merchant marine academies is situated in the State of New York, at King's Point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is discussing the committee amendment, to which there is no objection. The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to an amendment offered from the floor by the Senator from Massachusetts, to restore \$418,000, which was voted by the committee to be stricken out. In taking that action, the committee was under a misapprehension as to the existing law.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator for guiding me in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the committee amendment on page 331, in line 3.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the second amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. To the committee amendment beginning on page 330, after line 2, and ending on page 331 in line 11, the following amendment is proposed: On page 331, in line 10, strike out "\$3,930,520", and insert "\$4,348,520."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 331, after line 11, to strike out:

State marine schools: To reimburse the State of California, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in such States as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth, approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States to the said States for use in connection with such State marine

schools, and \$340,000 for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at an average yearly cost of not to exceed \$475 per cadet; \$668,000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 of the unobligated balance for this purpose contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

State marine schools: To reimburse the State of California, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of Massachusetts, \$50,000; and the State of New York, \$50,000; for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in such States as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth, approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1121-1123); \$153,000 for the maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States to the said States for use in connection with such State marine schools, and \$749,050 for the pay of 710 cadet midshipmen at \$65 per month and \$275 per annum for the subsistence of each cadet midshipman; \$1,102,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 332, line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950" and insert "Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 336, line 12, after the word "appliances", to strike out "\$875,847,795" and insert "\$887,621,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 340, line 1, after the word "application", to strike out "therefore" and insert "thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 342, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "4" and insert "6.7"; and on page 343, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "7" and insert "10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Claims Commission—Administrative expenses," on page 345, line 15, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Independent offices—General provisions," on page 349, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 110. None of the sections under the head "Independent offices, General provisions" in this title shall apply to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Inland Waterways Corporation, or the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Housing and Home Finance Agency," on page 353, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$17,724,000" and insert "\$17,524,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes chapter VIII of the bill.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment appearing in the next chapter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, have we passed from the portion of the bill

dealing with independent-offices appropriations, and are we now considering the portion of the bill dealing with civil-functions appropriations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Yesterday the Senator from Illinois was granted permission to offer any amendment he might wish to offer to the committee amendments from page 277 to page 283. Accordingly, the Senator from Illinois is recognized at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At the close of consideration by us of the committee amendments in this chapter, it had been my intention to advert to a certain matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 304, beginning in line 19, is a section, referring to public works advanced planning. It reads as follows:

Public works advance planning: The unexpended balances on June 30, 1950, of funds made available for public works advance planning under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 791), are hereby continued available for expenditure until June 30, 1951.

I have been checking into this matter since the conclusion of the consideration of this section of the bill by the committee; and I find that it will be possible to make a reduction there.

So I now move that on page 304, in line 19, the word "The" be stricken, and there be inserted in lieu thereof the words "Not to exceed \$4,000,000 of the," so that this action by the Senate will result in cutting out \$2,000,000 of the unexpended appropriation.

Then in line 24, after the—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may we act first on the amendment already stated by the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is all one amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is the Senator from Wyoming going to ask that all of it be handled as one amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. On what page does this amendment appear, Mr. President?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is on page 304.

Then, Mr. President, in line 24 on that page, after the numeral "1951", I move that the following be added:

The sum of \$2,000,000 carried in the said unexpended balance shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer that as a committee amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment just stated by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yesterday the Senator from Illinois was granted permission to offer amendments to certain items, and he is recognized at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of this portion of the bill whether any provision is made in the bill for the stockpiling program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MURRAY. On page 300, in line 19, I notice that the language stricken from the bill, as the bill is reported by the committee, seems to indicate that no provision is being made for a stockpiling program under which provision would be made to permit the purchase of materials for stockpiling in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the language which came over to us in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives, I am sure, was a technical error. In line 19, on page 300, after stating the amount of the appropriation, it read as follows:

Of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of said act of July 23, 1946—

And so forth. That would have meant that there would have been a limitation upon the expenditures for stockpiling within the United States. However, I am sure that was not the intention of the House committee or of the House of Representatives when they acted upon this matter.

In the Senate committee we voted to strike all of it out, because the Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946, in securing the passage of which the Senator from Montana was of such great help, provides specific authority for the purchase of strategic and critical materials within the United States. Indeed, that Act specifically encourages the development of such materials.

So I am sure that any difficulty can be straightened out in conference.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has been recognized. Does he wish to offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I regret that I was not present when consideration of the appropriation bill was resumed today. I have been in my office, keeping somewhat close tab on the probabilities in regard to the time when consideration of the bill would be resumed.

At 5:10 p. m. this afternoon, I was informed that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] was speaking, and that the probability was that he would speak for some time thereafter. Therefore, I did not think that the consideration of the appropriation bill would be resumed here so suddenly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the reservation made yesterday, the Senator from Illinois has received permission—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand about that, but I should like to make a further statement at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed, certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Continuing Mr. President, at 5:15, I received a telephone message that the appropriation bill was again being considered by the Senate. So I hurried here, arriving here at 5:20 p. m. When I arrived, I found that in that space of 5 minutes the Senate had moved from the consideration of the committee amendments on page 283 to the consideration of the committee amendments on page 329, or 46 pages, in 5 minutes. So I wish to congratulate the reading clerk for the speed and celerity with which he moved through those complicated pages of the bill. Yesterday in open-eyed amazement, I saw him move from page 277 to page 283—some 6 pages—in 6 seconds. However, I was not certain that he could maintain that pace over a long period of time. [Laughter.]

Nevertheless, Mr. President, today I find that due to the great ability of the reading clerk, the Senate covered over 45 pages in 5 minutes. So I can say that the Senate's reading clerk not only is qualified as a dash man, he is not only a verbal Jesse Owens, but he is also qualified as a middle-distance runner, for in running the half-mile he has demonstrated that he can sprint all the way. At the appropriate time I am going to move that we award to the reading clerk a medal for the celerity with which he has helped us get through this measure. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the result of this speed—almost exceeding as it did the velocity of light—is that I missed being on the floor of the Senate at the time when the Senate was considering the committee amendments from page 283 on. Accordingly, I must throw myself upon the mercy of the Senate in craving its indulgence and pardon for not having been here while the committee amendments on those pages were being read by the reading clerk and while the Senate deliberated at high speed upon them.

I believe that the Presiding Officer has ruled—and very properly—that because of the understanding arrived at on yesterday, I am privileged to request the reconsideration of the items up to page 283. However, I think I should now serve notice that I am going to request the reconsideration of a number of items from page 283 on. Whether the Senate will permit those items to be reconsidered, of course, is a matter for the Senate itself to determine.

Mr. President, on page 280, in line 9, in the item dealing with appropriations for the Bureau of the Budget, let me say that I hope we do not grant the \$26,000 increase, but, instead, hold to the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that the House of Representatives cut this appropriation by \$100,000. In its report the House committee explains that it was intended to deny funds to open a new central office in the field. However, upon examination of the figures it was discovered that only \$76,000 had been allocated to that purpose. The Senate committee agreed that the new field station should not be opened, but

the additional \$26,000 reduction above the \$74,000 which was intended to be cut out would, in the opinion of the committee, be a matter for the Bureau of the Budget, which actually has served a perfectly splendid purpose in cutting down the budget estimates.

I am glad to be able to tell the Senator that we went into the matter of the budget estimates at great length. The estimates which have come to the Congress on this bill were, by reason of the action of the Bureau of the Budget, some \$3,000,000,000 less than the requests made by the various bureaus and agencies. I think it would not be a wise reduction to cut that additional \$26,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to thank the Senator from Wyoming for his very clear and, of course, very accurate statement of the amounts to be appropriated for the Budget Bureau, which the Budget Bureau itself proposed. But I should like to point out that the House figure was \$86,000 above the amount for last year. The Senate figure will be \$112,000 above the amount for last year. Mr. President, we are in a situation where we must cut virtually every bureau, in order to release energies for the war. The Budget Bureau is a very fine organization, but like most other governmental agencies it should absorb some reductions. There is fat in the Budget Bureau. They will deny it, but there is certainly some fat there, as elsewhere. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I hope we can save \$26,000 and reject the committee amendment. I move that we reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote may be reconsidered, but that the argument of the Senator from Illinois be denied, and the committee amendment be again approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered. The question now is upon agreeing to the committee amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now move that on page 281, line 6, the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to which substituted \$215,500 for \$160,000 on the appropriation for the Philippine Alien Property Administration. I hope we may hold to the smaller House figure of \$160,000.

Mr. President, the work of this organization has diminished.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to ask unanimous consent that we reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, in order that the Senator may make his argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator may now proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amount appropriated by the House was \$160,000. The committee increased this

by \$55,000, bringing the total to \$215,000. The House committee, in its report, on page 201, states that the bulk of the \$55,000 cut which it imposed, as compared to the budget request, was for funds requested for terminal leave. In the judgment of the House committee, these funds can be absorbed in the 1950-51 funds, and therefore they put into effect their cut below the budget estimate. The Senate committee has restored this figure, but, in view of the diminished work which the Philippine Alien Property Administration is carrying on, I hope that we shall reconsider the committee amendment and will not approve it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like merely to say that the committee restored the budget estimate, and upon this estimate, after having examined the members of the Philippine Alien Property Administration, and in the belief that providing the budget estimate, that is to say, by increasing the amount that the House had cut, we would expedite the completion of the work. War claims have dragged out in past instances to a great period. This, I think, will expedite the disposal of all the work of this commission, and will be decidedly in the public interest. In any event, it will be clearly before the Congress. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I must now throw myself on the mercy of the Senate, from now on, because the pages 283 to 329 were covered in the 5 minutes between the time I left my office and the time I arrived on the floor of the Senate. I may say that I am going to ask reconsideration of appropriations as follows:

Page 288, line 4: This is an item for salaries and expenses of the Civil Service Commission. We should reject the committee increase of \$500,000 because the House committee report on page 204 pointed out the degree of overstaffing in this agency which was borne out in the House hearings, especially on pages 1459 and 1460. By rejecting the committee amendment we would save \$500,000.

Page 303, line 19: This is an item for advance planning of public works by the General Services Administration. I hope we may reconsider this item so that I may offer an amendment to reduce the amount to \$17,000,000, which would leave this program at last year's level. I do not believe we should increase these funds at the present time since this program was designed to get works planned in case of a depression and since, under the old program, we still have \$2,000,000,000 in works already planned not counting those for rivers, harbors, flood control, reclamation, and a host of others. If my amendment is adopted we will save \$10,000,000.

Page 307, line 12: This is an item for operating expenses of the General Services Administration. This new category of expenditures should be able to absorb the 7 percent cut provided for by the

House. If we reject the committee amendment we will save \$6,225,000.

Page 314, line 13: An item for general expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The House has already increased last year's appropriation by \$290,000. I see no reason for giving this agency its full budget request, as the committee has done, when we have not done so for most agencies. I hope we can reject the committee's amendment and save \$113,000.

Page 321, line 11: An item for salaries and expenses of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The House figure has already allowed an increase of \$380,000 for this Commission over funds expended last year should be enough. By rejecting the committee amendment we can save \$200,000.

Page 322, line 20: Salaries and expenses of the Smithsonian Institution—another case of allowing the full budget request while we have not done so in most agencies. We should reject the committee amendment and save \$163,510.

Page 325, line 17: If we accept the amendment which I shall offer, for reasons I hope to develop, we will save \$41,000,000.

Page 326, line 24: I hope we will reject this amendment and save \$3,658,000.

The sum total of these amendments which I hope will be adopted would save approximately \$60,000,000 in funds and contract authorizations I now move that the Senate reconsider the action by which it has approved these items, and that we take them up one by one.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope that I am not indulging in an excess of optimism in what I am about to say in my appeal to the Senator from Illinois. I hold in my hand the volume of the hearings by this committee on this chapter of the bill. It contains 1,136 pages of printed testimony. I assure the Senator that the members of the committee went into these items with the greatest care, and with the purpose of cutting appropriations wherever there was a possibility of cutting them. We had new estimates which were not before the House. Nevertheless, we have reported to the Senate a bill which is below the amount appropriated by the House.

The very unusual aspect of this chapter, different from any other chapter which is before the Senate, is that of the total amount of cash carried in the bill, 90 percent is for war-connected expenditures, and with respect to contract authorizations, 93 percent is for war-connected expenditures.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendments I am proposing do not deal with war-connected expenditures, unless we can take the Maritime Commission expenditures to be of that nature. The proposals I am now making are largely for a reduction of administrative costs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may suggest that the Maritime Commission certainly is

war-connected. There are many vessels in storage which may very shortly be used. I think it would be very unwise at this moment, when we are engaged in transporting men and materials across the Pacific Ocean because of what is going on in Korea, to cut the appropriation for the Maritime Commission below that which is provided for in the bill.

I am quite sincere in saying to the Senator that I am confident that in asking for the reconsideration of these various items, he is asking the Senate to reject the considered opinion of the members of the subcommittee on independent offices who carefully and judiciously, if I may say so, examined every one of the appropriations for the purpose of cutting wherever we could cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that, of course, we all respect him and we also respect the work of his committee, and one of the things which has always endeared him to the other Members of the Senate has been his constant willingness to listen to points that are made both on and off the floor, and to preserve an open mind regarding matters in dispute.

I want to make it clear that I do not pretend to omniscience. I make many mistakes, myself. It is quite possible that I am in error regarding some of the amendments which I am going to propose. But I should be grateful if the Senator from Wyoming, with his usual courtesy and gentleness, would at least allow me briefly to make my proposals for economy, and then he, doubtless, will be able to refute my arguments; and I am sure he probably has the votes to support him, no matter what may happen in the course of the argument itself.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Illinois feels that way, to conserve time would the Senator mind making his motion to reconsider all the amendments en bloc, and then if to any one of them the Senator wants to move an amendment, that may be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would permit my proposals to be killed all at once, rather than their dying a slow death one by one. I had been hoping that one or two of my suggestions might appeal to the Members of the Senate and that my efforts would not be entirely unavailing. I am not merely trying to make a record, Mr. President; I am hoping to save some money. I can promise the Senator from Wyoming that I shall try to be brief in discussing each one of the items, with the exception of the Maritime Commission. In that case there are enormous sums of money involved and both the General Accounting Office and a subcommittee of the House have indicated gross waste, negligence, or even worse in the payment of the construction and operation subsidies.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Chair kindly state the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which the amendments which he has mentioned were adopted. His motion was to reconsider them en bloc.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, but before I yield may I say that if unanimous consent is going to be refused, I should like to have an opportunity to make an argument on the largest item, which is that for the Maritime Commission. So, before the guillotine falls, I shall be glad to yield to my good friend, the gentle and able Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my distinguished friend for his customary courtesy.

I am interested in an item involving the maritime program, at page 330 of the bill, and it well may be that I would approach the subject from a little different angle, because I should like to add an item rather than to subtract one. Nevertheless, since we have an identity of geographic interest in this bill, I should like to concur with him in the hope that he might let it be open for consideration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad the able Senator from Florida finds his interest coinciding with mine in the desire to reconsider this item, although, unfortunately, I regret that he is trying to increase the amount in the bill and is not joining in an effort to diminish it.

Mr. PEPPER. I propose construction rather than subtraction.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I suggest that we eliminate that one item, and vote on the others?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think that is a very constructive suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the action by which the amendments have been adopted, with the exception stated by the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it, and the motion is not agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the action of the Senate in adopting the amendment relating to the Maritime Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Members of the Senate turn to pages 324, 325, and 326 of the bill which is before us. It will be noticed that line 17 on page 325 carries an appropriation of \$63,000,000 for new ship construction, which was made by the House and continued by the Senate.

If Senators will turn to page 326 they will note that on line 17 there is a further authorization of \$64,875,000 made available, or a combined total of \$127,875,000. The figure of \$64,875,000 is, presumably, merely to carry over previous authorizations which have been made. But, Mr. President, we are, putting at the disposal of the Maritime Commission a total sum of more than \$127,000,000 for subsidies on new ship construction. It should be realized that these sums are not all di-

rectly connected with any immediate war effort. They were put into the budget and inserted by the committee prior to the war situation. They were designed to carry out a permanent merchant-marine and not to meet any sudden need for shipping in connection with the Korean war. If additional maritime shipping is needed in connection with hostilities, it can be covered in any war appropriations bill which is introduced.

So that the issue before us, Mr. President, deals really with the long time merchant-marine policy of the Nation.

The Members of this body are aware of the investigations of the Maritime Commission which have been made by the General Accounting Office under the direction of Mr. Lindsay Warren, and also, on two occasions, by a House subcommittee headed by Representative Porter Hardy of Virginia. We are all acquainted with the head of the General Accounting Office, Mr. Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina, a fellow North Carolinian of the distinguished Senator who is presiding at the moment. He is a man of great integrity, a man of great ability, and is a noble public servant.

Mr. Warren has found that the Maritime Commission made gross overpayments in connection with construction subsidies and in connection with operating subsidies, and these charges by the head of the General Accounting Office, the Comptroller General of the United States, were investigated by the House committee headed, as I have said, by Representative HARDY of Virginia.

Representative HARDY comes from a district close to the great shipbuilding center of Norfolk. Therefore certainly he is not a man who would be prejudiced against the shipbuilding interests.

Yet on two occasions, last year and this year, the House committee, I believe, unanimously made its report saying that excessive operating and excessive construction subsidies had been paid by the Maritime Commission apparently involving many of these same items that are included in the appropriation bill.

It will be remembered that last year the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] mentioned a similar item in the appropriation bill for that year, involving the ships *Mariposa* and the *Monterey*. We had a long colloquy on that subject on the floor of the Senate.

I have gone into this matter in some detail and some weeks ago I addressed a letter to the Acting Administrator of the Maritime Administration, because, as we know, the organization has changed somewhat in the last few weeks. I wrote to Mr. John T. Koehler, and in the letter I asked four questions concerning the \$63,000,000 item for construction subsidies:

1. What are the vessels to be covered by the contract authority?
2. Have formal applications been filed by the companies which would benefit from this contract authority?
3. According to present calculations, is it reasonable to assume that these contracts will be let before June 30, 1951?
4. What is the status in detail of these negotiations?

On July 18, Mr. Koehler replied to my letter. I ask unanimous consent that at

this point in my remarks a copy of my letter to Mr. Koehler and his reply be inserted in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 29, 1950.

MR. JOHN T. KOEHLER,
Administrator of Maritime Administration,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KOEHLER: In my studies of the pending appropriations bill I find an item of \$63,000,000 in contract authority for maritime subsidies. This has raised four questions in my mind and I would be grateful for the answers to the following questions:

1. What are the vessels to be covered by this contract authority?
2. Have formal applications been filed by the companies who would benefit from this contract authority?
3. According to present calculations is it reasonable to assume that these contracts will be let before June 30, 1951?
4. What is the status in detail of these negotiations?

I would very much appreciate a reply to this letter as early as possible.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1950.

The Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Reference is made to your letter of June 29, 1950, concerning an item of \$63,000,000 in the 1951 appropriation bill.

Our 1951 construction budget as submitted to Congress after approval by the Bureau of the Budget called for contract authority of \$75,000,000, made up as follows:

1 prototype naval auxiliary vessel.....	\$10,000,000
2 passenger vessels for New York and east coast South America service.....	65,000,000
Total	75,000,000

The cash required with respect to the above was estimated at \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1951. The remaining contract authority balance of \$70,000,000 was reduced to \$63,000,000 by the House, which represents a straight 10 percent reduction.

We shall endeavor to answer your questions in the order listed by you.

"1. What are the vessels to be covered by the contract authority?"

There is now being operated on Trade Route No. 1, between New York and ports on the east coast of South America, under bareboat charter to Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., the Government-owned "Good Neighbor Fleet" (comprised of the steamships *Argentina*, *Brazil*, and *Uruguay*). The vessels included in our 1951 budget as listed above would replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet," all three vessels in this fleet having already become 20 years old.

"2. Have formal applications been filed by the companies who would benefit from this contract authority?"

No formal applications have been filed for the construction of passenger vessels by any company or companies for operation on Trade Route No. 1. Further in this connection see answer to question No. 4 hereinafter.

"3. According to present calculations is it reasonable to assume that these contracts will be let before June 30, 1951?"

At the time our 1951 budget was filed, it was believed that it would be possible to execute contracts for the construction and sale to a private company of the necessary passenger-carrying vessels to replace the "Good

Neighbor Fleet." Our latest and very recent estimate is that contracts with respect to such new vessels cannot be awarded until about November 1, 1951. Further in connection with this question see answer to No. 4 hereinafter.

"4. What is the status in detail of these negotiations?"

The former Maritime Commission having been unsuccessful in effecting an agreement with the present charterers of the "Good Neighbor Fleet" whereby they, prior to the expiration of their current charter, would agree to purchase new vessels for this service, the Maritime Administration is preparing to send out an invitation for bids with respect to the charter of the "Good Neighbor Fleet" after the expiration of the current charter, which charter, as recently extended, will expire not later than June 30, 1951. The invitation for bids, will also require that each bidder submit such replacement program as will, in its opinion, adequately replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet." The three vessels have a total passenger capacity of 1,557. As each bidder will be given some leeway as to the general characteristics of the replacement vessels, it is possible that the successful bidder will be required to build anywhere from two to four vessels. However, the amount requested for this project appears to represent as close an estimate, as can be made at this juncture, of the total construction cost of all of the vessels to be constructed for Trade Route No. 1. The delay in getting out bids for a new charter of the "Good Neighbor Fleet" and thereby extending the possible date for letting a contract for replacements has been due to a combination of circumstances not foreseen when the budget in question was prepared, which delay is the reason why we now estimate that it is not likely that the replacements will be contracted for during the fiscal year 1951.

H. R. 7786 as it passed the House carries the following proviso with respect to the \$63,000,000 item: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year, nor to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approved the start of such ship construction and the director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term budget includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates."

Some of the 1949 appropriation authority was earmarked for the construction of a combination vessel for account of the Mississippi Shipping Co. estimated to cost \$16,000,000. However, the 1949 appropriation authority lapsed before a construction contract could be executed.

In the 1950 Appropriation Act, the following contract authority also lapsed as of June 30, 1950:

2 combination passenger vessels for Grace Line Inc. for operation in New York to Caribbean service.....	\$31,500,000
2 trailerships for the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. for operation in the United States west coast intercoastal service.....	22,000,000
Design for national defense vessels.....	3,900,000
Miscellaneous betterments.....	875,000
Total.....	58,275,000

We have applications on file with respect to the construction of the trailerships, without construction subsidy, as listed above and also applications from the Arnold Bernstein

Line for the purchase of war-built vessels, the *General Pope* and *General Weigel*, and for a construction-differential allowance with respect to the conversion of these two vessels for commercial operation, the total cost of such conversion having been estimated at a maximum of \$9,500,000. While Grace Line Inc. has indicated a strong interest in the construction of two combination vessels, with the aid of a construction-differential, for its Caribbean service, no formal application with respect thereto has been filed as yet. The American President Lines, Ltd., under date of April 13, 1950, filed applications for construction-differential aid in the construction of four combination vessels for operation in its round-the-world service.

It is our understanding that, subject to the prior approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the provision in H. R. 7786, quoted above would make it possible to use any or all of the \$63,000,000 with respect to the construction or improvement of vessels not listed in the 1951 budget should it develop, as it now appears, that no contract authority will be utilized in connection with the vessels for replacing the "Good Neighbor Fleet" until after the close of the fiscal year 1951.

Based on the latest estimates of our staff, it does not now appear possible to award contracts with respect to any of the vessels mentioned herein prior to July 1, 1951, except contracts applicable to vessels for the Pacific Coast Steamship Co., the Arnold Bernstein Line and the construction (\$10,000,000) and design (\$2,500,000) of the Navy prototype vessel. However, since contract authority cannot be used until and unless there are properly executed contracts and as it is more satisfactory to consider and dispose of applications for new construction on their merit under the 1936 act where the contract authority is available, we suggest that it would be desirable not to reduce the \$63,000,000 contract authority now in the 1951 appropriation bill. Moreover, by not reducing same it would give us more leeway in dealing with new applications, if any, that may be filed in the meantime and also in meeting the situation, should it develop that a better schedule can be met, than we now contemplate, for executing contracts with respect to applications now pending.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. KOEHLER,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to say that I think Mr. Koehler is to be commended for his frankness and for his cooperation in helping to provide Congress with information which is necessary for our purposes.

He stated that the \$63,000,000 in contract authorizations—and that is the amount provided by the House—were to be used to replace Government-owned "Good Neighbor Fleet" operated by the Moore-McCormack Line between New York and South America. However, no further applications have been filed for this program. While at the time the 1951 budget was filed the Maritime Commission thought it could execute these contracts, the present estimates of the Maritime Administration are that they cannot be awarded until about November 1, 1951. This means that all of the \$63,000,000 authorization provided by the House cannot possibly be reached during the ensuing fiscal year for the purpose for which it is provided. It should therefore be eliminated. However, we can now deal with the matter in part by continuing the House appropriation and cutting down on the additional contract authorizations provided in the Senate amendment.

Subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget the provisions of the bill would allow the Maritime Commission to use \$63,000,000 in authorizations for other contracts. According to the last paragraph of Mr. Koehler's letter it does not now appear possible to award before July 1, 1951, any contracts presently under consideration except the following: \$22,000,000 for the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. for trailer ships on the west coast. Now note the next item in the case of the Arnold Bernstein Line: Conversion of two war-built troop vessels for commercial use—\$9,500,000 for that. Not for the conversion of commercial ships to troop use, but conversion of troop ships to commercial use.

Construction of Navy prototype vessels, \$10,000,000. Design of Navy prototype vessels, \$2,500,000.

Mr. President, the total amount that can possibly be awarded for the fiscal year 1950-51 on the basis of contracts under consideration is \$44,000,000, not \$63,000,000. The pending Arnold Bernstein contract calls for the conversion of two troop ships, the *General Pope* and the *General Weigel*, to commercial use.

In the face of the present world situation I cannot believe that the Maritime Administration would permit the conversion of troop transports into commercial vessels. So it seems that the total amount of \$44,000,000 could be reduced by the further amount of \$9,500,000, leaving \$34,500,000 for contracts now pending, and about which information is now available. Furthermore \$6,600,000 of the \$64,875,000 extension allowed by the committee has already been awarded, so that will not be needed. This is a total of \$41,100,000 not needed.

Mr. President, I therefore intend to offer an amendment to the committee amendment striking the figure of \$64,875,000 and inserting in lieu thereof the figure of \$23,775,000.

I think that explains a somewhat complicated situation in as few words as it is possible for me to explain it. It would effect a saving of \$41,100,000.

I now move to strike out "\$63,875,000," and to insert instead "\$23,775,000."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to support the amendments of the Senator from Illinois. With the possible exception of the RFC, the operation of the Maritime Commission has been probably the greatest scandal of government in the last 10 years. I believe it is due to the fact that those who have profited by the mispending, wastefulness, and looting of the appropriations for the Maritime Commission have been in effect running the Commission. I do not think any more temptation than is necessary should be put in their way. When Congress approved the reorganization plan of the President transferring the operation and functions of the Maritime Commission to the Commerce Department, it was made possible for the President to correct the very unsavory situation in the Maritime Commission. It is my belief that the President has failed to take advantage of the opportunity to perform this duty. I feel that we are going to see a continuation of the same wasteful and illegal—according to the Comptroller General—manipulations of the

maritime affairs that we have seen over the past 10 years. It is safe to say that the Maritime Commission expenditures have cost hundreds of millions of dollars, and perhaps even billions of dollars, to the taxpayers. Through their manipulations we have put the merchant marine in a state of absolute dependency on Government so that very few ship lines will go on the high seas and attempt to operate a shipping business as it should be operated. There are a few notable exceptions.

Mr. President, I do not know whether we are in an emergency. I understood the President to ask for emergency war powers, but he has not proclaimed any emergency. If there is an emergency, as the Senator from Illinois says, then the amount provided here will in the long run be only a drop in the bucket, and might as well not be considered at all. I believe the President should tell the people of the country whether there is an emergency or whether there is not, and proclaim one if there is.

I believe that here is a chance to save forty or fifty million dollars from a peacetime program and which will have a great deal of labor and material for the war effort.

I think the Senate should support the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and I for one would like to see a record vote on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I sympathize completely with everything that can be said for congressional action to prevent waste. I submit that it is perfectly clear that the action of the President in sending a reorganization plan to the Congress for the Maritime Commission was a step which was intended to inject a very much higher degree of efficiency and care in the administration of the funds appropriated for the activities carried on formerly by the Maritime Commission, and now to be carried on under Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950, which became effective on May 24, 1950.

The committee in examining the appropriations for the Maritime Commission had in mind the fact that we did have a legislative reorganization, and the committee felt that while scrutinizing these expenditures and these estimates it should not undertake to destroy the effectiveness of the agency of the Government which, under the reorganization plan, the President and the Congress are trying to reform.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that the committee reported an appropriation which was \$63,000,000 below the estimates. There was no charge of waste leveled before our committee with respect to the current administration. No representation was made to us, except through our own examination of the witnesses, which prompted us to make cuts. We are dealing here with a program which extends over a period of years. It is impossible to build an ocean line in a month, or 2 months, or 6 months, or a year. Sometimes the operation takes several years, because the building of a modern liner which plies the ocean is a great engineering undertaking.

In providing cash, we had a program of \$13,700,000 to pay for obligations for the years 1947 and 1948. No one had charged that there was anything wrong about those obligations.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the obligations include any payment to the owners of the *Mariposa* or the *Monterey*?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; not a penny. We went into that question, I will say to the Senator from Vermont.

The bill also provides cash for the 1949 program. The House reduced the cash appropriation, to which the Senator from Illinois referred, from \$70,000,000 to \$63,000,000, as I recall the figures.

So, I say to the Members of the Senate, let us not condemn the program and the new administrators of the program upon the basis of charges which were made against a commission which no longer exists.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask to what new administrators of the program the Senator refers. The President has appointed the old administrator, whom the House committee roundly condemned for failing to carry out his work properly for the last 2 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reorganization plan divided the functions into the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration. Of course, General Fleming has been reappointed to a position of importance in the new organization, but General Fleming was not in the other administration for a long time.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand General Fleming was the chairman of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For scarcely a year.

Mr. AIKEN. I like General Fleming personally. I did not have the heart to vote against his confirmation even though I did not consider him qualified for the post. But the Senator must be familiar with the House report on maritime affairs, which cited case after case in which money was wasted, squandered, spent illegally under the General's administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I point out to the Senator that those cases all took place before General Fleming was appointed.

Mr. AIKEN. According to the House committee, they continued at an accelerated rate even after he took over the chairmanship.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not ready to acknowledge that to be a fact. I would say to the Senator from Vermont that the members of the subcommittee who heard the testimony this year and last year, feel I am sure, as the Senator from Vermont has just said he feels, that General Fleming is a man of character and ability. The Senator from Vermont, though he did a very excellent piece of work in the criticisms he voiced upon the floor of the Senate with respect to the administration of the Maritime Commission in times past, was unwilling to condemn General Fleming by voting against his nomination. All I am saying now is, do not deprive the reorganized group of

the funds which they need to carry on the work which the legislative authority of the Government has directed them to do. If there is any change of policy, to be made it should be made, not in the appropriation bill, but by proceeding before the legislative committee in charge.

I will say to the Senator from Vermont and to the Senator from Illinois that if I am correctly advised an opportunity will be presented to them before we are through with this appropriation bill to give their views and exercise their right to oppose amendments which, if agreed to, will greatly increase the expenditures.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I would first like to say that I hold President Truman wholly responsible for the work of the Maritime Commission from now on. It is his appointees that will have this work to do. What I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming—and I ask him this question as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—Does the Senator from Wyoming believe that this Nation is in a state of emergency at the present time, and is that emergency likely to last until the next Congress convenes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Indeed I do believe it is in a state of emergency, and I think the emergency will last throughout the life of the next Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe it would be good business to start the construction of ocean liners, which scarcely can be completed for years, in competition with the war effort, which may require all the men and materials which otherwise would be used in starting the construction of these long-range projects?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If this emergency develops, as every indication would suggest, we will certainly need the vessels which are authorized in this program.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator then believe that we are in for a permanent emergency?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is merely bandying words when he asks that question.

Mr. AIKEN. Considering the length of time it takes to build a liner I would say that that is probably the Senator's assumption.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if there is going to be a prolonged discussion of this particular amendment, may I suggest that we pass it over and come back to it later?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know whether there will be prolonged discussion. I have finished speaking.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to point out one feature. The total of \$127,875,000 which will be provided for the Maritime Administration by these two amendments is vastly in excess of the amounts which the Maritime Administration itself says it can spend during this period. It is approximately \$41,000,000 more than the Maritime Administration can spend.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KERR. Do I understand the Senator to say that it is that much in excess of either what the Commission can spend during the 12 months, or contract to spend at a later date under contracts made within that period?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The Senator from Oklahoma has put the situation very well.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask whether the amounts set forth in the appropriation bill, \$63,000,000 and \$64,000,000 are earmarked for specific purposes? In other words, must the amounts be used for the construction or repair or reconstruction of specifically named vessels, or can the amounts be used for the construction of an entirely different set of vessels?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the \$63,000,000 was to be used to replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet" operated by the Moore-McCormack Line, but that no formal applications have been filed for the program; and the present estimate of the Maritime Commission is that it cannot award such contracts until about November 1, 1951, or after the expiration of the current fiscal year for which we are appropriating. In effect, these two appropriations and authorizations would give to the Maritime Commission \$41,000,000 which they could use for any purpose that they personally see fit without proposing any program to Congress for approval. And carrying out the point made by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I want to say that I do not believe that the record of the Maritime Administration personnel is such that we should give them \$41,000,000 of blank checks with which they can carry out further subsidies beyond those which they themselves now say they can implement.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may point out that the management of the maritime operations of the country has not been changed materially by the recent transfer. The most striking change has been the firing of Commissioner McKeough, of Illinois, who over the years has been struggling against odds to maintain some degree of integrity and efficiency in the Maritime Commission, and he has fought against overwhelming odds to do that. Yet when the time came when the President could revamp the Maritime Commission in accordance with the desires of the Congress, he fired Commissioner McKeough and left most of those responsible for the sins of the past in a position to continue to commit those sins in the future.

I had hoped that Secretary Sawyer, if he remained in the Cabinet, would be able to exercise some degree of control over the operations of this ex-commission. But I understand that whenever the Director or the Under Secretary in charge of transportation matters is in Washington, Secretary Sawyer will have very little to say about it. It is only

when the Director is away that an Assistant Director, who is appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, will have some control over the situation.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts in a moment. First I want to comment on the remarks of the eminent senior Senator from Vermont. No one regretted more than I did the dropping of Commissioner McKeough from the Maritime Commission. We in Illinois are very proud of him because of the courageous fight he made to eliminate unnecessary and even illegal subsidies. We regret very much that he was dropped. In justice to the President it ought to be said, however, that the other members of the Commission, with the exception of the chairman, General Fleming, were also dropped. General Fleming was made Assistant Secretary of Commerce in general charge of transportation. My feeling is very similar to that of the Senator from Vermont. The general had given good service prior to the time he went on the Maritime Commission, and I personally did not have the heart to vote against confirmation of his nomination although I did not approve of his policies on the Maritime Commission.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may add that most of those in charge of operations in the past have been continued in the new set-up, except some of those who tried their best to assist Commissioner McKeough in maintaining, as I said, some degree of integrity and efficiency in the Commission, have been demoted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is precisely the point to which I was coming, that although some good men have been put in at the top of the new Maritime Administration, the personnel down below is in the main the same personnel that operated under the Maritime Commission, and whose work was accompanied by the gross scandals which Mr. Lindsay Warren and the House committee said existed. It is in view of that fact, as well as the need for economy. I do not want to see the United States giving them a check for \$127,000,000, when the new administrator says that about all that he can possibly spend under existing proposals will be about \$81,000,000. I do not think the record of the personnel of the Maritime Administration group is such that we should put into their hands these great powers to spend additional sums of money for purposes not at present contemplated. I feel that these sums would probably be spent but also probably not for the right purposes.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I have stated on the floor of the Senate on a number of occasions, I am going to vote against the construction of public works so far as it is possible to do so, whether such public works are flood control, rivers and harbors, or construction of buildings. I shall

vote deep cuts in those appropriations. But, as I have also stated, I am unwilling to vote against anything that is a defense measure.

Even though it may not be possible for some months to use these moneys under the schedules that have been read by the Senator from Illinois, nevertheless, in view of the fact that the appropriation is not limited to the particular projects set forth in the language of the bill, it would appear to me that this is a defense measure pure and simple, and it is my opinion further that we are going to be required to spend a great deal more money, vastly larger sums, for the development of our merchant marine during the emergency.

I wonder why the Senator from Illinois should be opposed to a measure which to me looks like a defense measure, regardless of the fact that the particular projects, or the particular purposes enunciated in the bill may not be carried out, because there is no limitation with regard to the purposes which these sums can be used for in this emergency as a part of our defense mechanism.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New York that this proposal did not originate as a defense measure when these items were inserted in the bill, which was before the Korean situation developed, so that the original purpose was not keyed to any national emergency. It was keyed to ordinary peacetime cold-war needs. My amendment would not cut any defense programs.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may finish, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Fundamentally, I suppose what it boils down to—and this is a hard thing to say—is that I simply do not sufficiently trust the personnel running the Maritime Commission to be willing to give them a blank check for \$41,000,000, in excess of the amounts required for the ships which are under consideration, for them to do with as they wish. Their past record is not such as to justify any such public trust.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is not it true that, instead of being a defense measure, a goodly portion of this proposed appropriation is exactly the reverse, in that it proposes that some millions of dollars be used to convert into commercial ships some ships which now are troop ships, and are qualified for the moving of troops, and were built for that purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is entirely correct as to that.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first let me reply to the Senator from Florida.

The Senator from Florida is completely correct in his suggestion that, as I said originally, this is a proposal in the case of the Arnold Bernstein Line, that

two troop ships, the *General Pope* and the *General Weigel*, be converted for commercial purposes, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out. So part of this program is one for national defense in reverse.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I should first yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I do so now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator from Illinois if he would yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to make a very brief statement, and then perhaps I shall end up by asking a question of the Senator from Wyoming, who is in charge of the committee's report on this portion of the bill.

I sat on the subcommittee which listened to a great deal of the testimony regarding this portion of the bill. As I understand, the program for 1947 through 1952 calls for estimated obligations in the amount of \$321,737,830, and there have been cash appropriations of \$141,878,685, leaving unfinanced obligations of \$179,859,145.

What we are appropriating this year, if we carry through with the program, will cut down the unfinanced obligations by the amount of the cash appropriations made now, and reduce delay on work already started. On that point we do not have much to say.

But, as I understand the matter, this item calls for the building of two new passenger ships and one Navy prototype vessel. I do not recall just what that vessel is to be. However, the two passenger ships are for the South American and Caribbean trade, if I recall correctly.

My question is this: If we adopt the committee recommendation, there will be nothing to be taken to conference in regard to this item, because the figures as reported by our committee are the same as those voted by the House of Representatives.

However, if we adopt an amendment to this item, then in the conference it will be considered, and at that time there will be a question as to whether the construction of the two passenger vessels should be begun at the present time or whether the program should be changed.

Under those circumstances, would it not be advisable to accept an amendment—I do not say that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is the correct one—in order that there may be something in connection with this item to be considered by the conference committee, so as to give it an opportunity to determine what should be done in this matter, and thus giving the Senate another opportunity to act and to see whether the present proposal is the correct one, in view of the situation which has developed since the committee considered this item?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to speak now, let me say that the Senator from Massachusetts has always been a most persuasive member of my subcommittee in dealing

with these matters. Of course, the program is based on the premise that maritime construction is in the interest of the national defense.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, it is true that the plan calls for the construction of two passenger vessels and a prototype naval vessel. I should like to read the first paragraph of the material which we obtained in support of this item:

In the interest of national defense and a well-balanced American merchant marine, it is proposed to contract in fiscal year 1951 for the construction under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, two or three passenger-carrying vessels and for the construction, under title VII, of a prototype craft which, in an emergency, may be massed-produced as naval auxiliaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Wyoming referring to the possibility of replacing with new vessels the ships in the so-called "good neighbor fleet"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a part of the matter, yes. However, I was about to say—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has a copy of the letter from Mr. Koehler, I believe, in which Mr. Koehler says that he does not believe those contracts can possibly be executed during the ensuing year. Does not the Senator have a copy of that letter? I ask that question because the letter which Mr. Koehler addressed to me had a notation to the effect that a copy was being sent to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. It was understood, of course, that the House made some reduction.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not true, as I have stated, that in the use of these funds the Maritime Commission is not limited to using them for any specific projects?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not unless a contract is made.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. But in these matters it is not limited to using these funds for the good neighbor fleet or for the Arnold Bernstein vessels or for ships of the character of those to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. But the Commission can use these funds for the development of vessels or for the construction of vessels in the national defense; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Let me say that I think it is extremely unwise to reduce this appropriation, because I believe that at the present moment the United States is in a position in which it must maintain an adequate merchant marine. If, unfortunately, we should find ourselves compelled to transport more men and more materials for military purposes, then vessels will be of great value.

However, when Senators on this side of the aisle and Senators, such as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], on the other side of the aisle rise and ask, "Why should we build a passenger vessel at this time?" I am moved to reply that I would be quite willing to take an amendment of this kind to conference, so that in the conference we may determine whether to construct the passenger vessels.

So, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois, if I may do so, how he obtained the figure of \$34,500,000 which he offers in his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is the amount that can be awarded during the applicable fiscal year. It is taken from the letter written by Mr. Koehler. If the Senator from Wyoming has a copy of the letter with him, he will find this statement appearing on page 3 of that letter—and I refer now to the final paragraph, as follows:

Except contracts applicable to vessels for the Pacific Coast Steamship Co., the Arnold Bernstein Line and the construction (\$10,000,000) and design (\$2,500,000) of the Navy prototype vessel.

Those totals, including contracts in regard to the Arnold Bernstein Line, come to \$44,000,000.

However, I could not believe that at this time any of us would vote to carry through the Arnold Bernstein project for the conversion of troop ships into commercial ships.

So if from the \$44,000,000, we eliminate \$9,500,000, that will leave \$34,500,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I call for a vote on this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Was the amount reported by the committee in contemplation of the building of the vessels to which the Koehler letter refers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We allowed the measure in this respect to stand in exactly the same way it stood when the House passed it. The Koehler letter itself was not before our committee. It has been written since then, and I have not had an opportunity to examine it. But I feel very strongly that we should not at this time suspend the funds for the construction of vessels which we may certainly need upon the seas within the next couple of years.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator think that authorizations should be made for an amount of money which the agency itself says cannot be spent within the period of time for which the authorizations are made?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a very pertinent question, I may say to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of

the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 325, line 17, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that Senators seconding the request for the yeas and nays be asked to rise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators desiring to second the demand for the yeas and nays will rise.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I suggest that this amendment go over to the end, and that we proceed with the other committee amendments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no reconsideration involved. The Senator from Illinois is moving to amend the figure in the bill, which was not touched by any Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, this is a parliamentary question. The Senator from Illinois made a motion to reconsider a number of amendments, and omitted from the motion the amendment relating to the Maritime Commission. The Senate voted against reconsideration of the other amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois then moved to reconsider the vote by which this amendment was agreed to, because it has to be reconsidered, if the Senator from Illinois is to be permitted to offer his amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I may be in error, but I have before me the printed amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say, Mr. President, that the amendment which I offered from the floor differs from the printed amendment. The amendment I have just offered is directed to page 326, and it proposes to strike out \$64,875,000 and to substitute \$23,775,000, and thus to effect a saving of \$41,100,000, the amount in excess of the sums which the Maritime Administration has committed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois relates to the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that this amendment be passed over for the time being, and that we proceed to less controversial matters.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understand this is the only amendment which remains in this chapter.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask what would be gained by passing it over? When would the vote be taken? The Senator from Vermont must be absent from the Senate one day and was hoping this amendment would be taken up today.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest that we proceed with the other amendments, and then if the Senator insists on taking up this amendment this evening we can return to it later on.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire what the other amendments are which are more

important than this? And if this concludes one chapter of the bill, why not finish it now?

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not say that the other amendments were more important than this. I said "less controversial."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it seems to me we are ready to vote on the question, and if it is delayed some Senator may have a happy thought and enter into another argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which the Senate adopted the committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then if we are going to vote, I am going to have to suggest the absence of a quorum. That is what I wanted to avoid at this time. I thought we could proceed with other amendments and then return to this a little later, if the Senate insists upon that being done.

remaining amendment in this chapter. Mr. McFARLAND. I know it is the only remaining amendment in this chapter, but there are three or four other chapters.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming accept the amendment which has been suggested and take it to conference? It is an entirely new amendment on the part of the Senate, and will be in controversy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, one of the best subcommittees in the Appropriations Committee considered this chapter of the bill. They heard the proof. They took the evidence. They have gone through weeks of hearings, and I say that I am unwilling to agree to take the amendment to conference. In my opinion, it would not be right to do so. I should be opposed to it, and so, probably, would most of the other Senators. If the amendment were taken to conference and not retained we would then be put in a false position. Someone would say, "We are not treating the Senate fairly, because the Senate voted to include it in the bill." If Senators agree to the amendment, very well, but I oppose it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that the hearings on this peacetime program were held by the committee before the start of the Korean war, or the Korean police action?

Mr. McKELLAR. That made it all the more necessary that the committee amendment be agreed to. Those ships are vitally needed in the defense, not of Korea, but of the United States. Senators are voting against the United States, when they vote for what is now proposed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I resent that statement. The Senator from Tennessee knows that these ships cannot be finished for 3 years. Does the Senator think it will take 3 or 4 years to put an end to the Korean invasion? That is a silly thing to say, and it is an unkind thing, too.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is also a very improper thing for one Senator to rise and say that another Senator is acting silly or talking in a silly manner.

Mr. AIKEN. It is no more appropriate for the Senator from Tennessee to say that the Senator from Vermont is working against the United States than it is for the Senator from Vermont to say the same thing about the Senator from Tennessee, and to say that he is trying to force an unnecessary burden on the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if that is the attitude of the Senator from Vermont, and if that is the way he feels about it, I refuse to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion, as the Chair stated it. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Anderson	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Darby	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Donnell	Knowland	Schoeppel
Douglas	Langer	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eaton	Lodge	Sparkman
Ferguson	McCarrahan	Stennis
Frear	McCarthy	Taft
Graham	McClellan	Thye
Green	McFarland	Tobey
Gurney	McKellar	Tydings
Hayden	McMahon	Watkins
Hendrickson	Malone	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Martin	Williams
Hill		Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment appearing on page 326 was adopted. On this motion the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, does the proviso on page 323 apply to the amount involved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a part of the committee amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas

[Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Holland	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kerr	Stennis
Darby	Kerr	Taft
Donnell	Langer	Thye
Douglas	Lodge	Tobey
Eastland	McCarthy	Watkins
Eaton	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Mundt	
Hendrickson	Saltonstall	

NAYS—32

Anderson	Hunt	Maybank
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chavez	Kilgore	Neely
Frear	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Graham	Lehman	Pepper
Green	McCarran	Russell
Hayden	McClellan	Sparkman
Hill	McFarland	Tydings
Hoey	McKellar	Young
Humphrey	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—30

Benton	Fulbright	Millikin
Brewster	George	Murray
Butler	Gillette	O'Connor
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Cordon	Kefauver	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Long	Vandenberg
Ellender	Lucas	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	Withers

So Mr. DOUGLAS' motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move on page 326, line 17, to strike out "\$64,875,000" and to substitute in lieu thereof "\$23,775,000", making a saving of \$41,100,000 and giving the Maritime Commission along with the \$63,000,000 provided on page 325, a total of \$86,775,000 with which they can carry out all the construction for which they have made commitments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. [Putting the question.] The yeas have it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I insist that the yeas and nays were demanded before the result of the vote was announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have the question stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment, on page 326, line 17, to strike out "\$64,875,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$23,775,000."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Chair had announced the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had announced it, but it was brought to the attention of the Chair that the demand for the yeas and nays had been made before the announcement was made, and the Chair wants to be fair to every Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Chair think that was a figment of the imagination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would not pass on that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the amendment about to be voted on is most important. The appropriation recommended should not be eliminated at this time, when the United States needs ships for both troops and supplies. I insist that a vote in favor of this reduction in the appropriation would be a vote against the defense of the United States of America.

Senators may say what they care to about 3 or 4 years being required to build these ships; suppose it takes 5 or 6 years. We may need them 5 or 6 years from now more than we need them today.

Merely because some of us might not have liked the work of the Maritime Commission is no excuse for the Senate to take action which will adversely affect the defense of the United States. If Senators want to do that—and I do not believe they do—then they will cast their votes in favor of the proposed reduction.

To say that this appropriation was placed in the bill before the Korean war broke out is not a valid argument. If the appropriation was needed at the time the bill was drawn, it is needed threefold today, and I plead with the Senate not to vote against the defense of the country, not to vote against giving supplies which are needed by the boys who are fighting in Korea.

Mr. President, we hear question raised as to whether the President has declared an emergency. That is immaterial. We know that the United States is in a period of emergency. There is no dispute about that. There is no dispute that the boys of the Nation are dying on the battle front, and I say for the United States Senate to vote to cut down appropriations with which to build ships and furnish supplies is to vote against the

defense of the Nation, to vote against those who are fighting for us in Korea.

Mr. President, I plead with my colleagues with all the power at my command to stand by the committee which heard the evidence. There are many items which could be cut with more reason than this one. The people will be looking at this vote. They are going to look to see whether the Senate is willing to support the boys on the battle front. I hope the item will not be cut.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the reduction in the appropriation for a completely different reason from that referred to by the Senator from Arizona. I am just as strongly in favor of providing adequate defense as he is—and we all are for that. But the situation is simply this: Since 1947 there has been for ship construction an estimated obligation of approximately \$321,000,000. I am speaking from memory, and these figures may be somewhat out of line. All that we have paid in cash is about \$141,000,000, leaving approximately \$179,000,000 still to pay.

For new ship construction this year there is appropriated, approximately, in contract authority, \$63,000,000 and \$5,000,000 cash. That money is for two new passenger ships to go into the South American and Caribbean trade; a third ship, to cost \$10,000,000, is a Navy prototype ship. I believe that is a ship that is an experiment, intended to go from San Francisco to Los Angeles. It will take on trailer trucks in San Francisco, and put new mules on the trailers in Los Angeles. I may not be correct in that, but I believe I am.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me complete a very brief statement. The amounts agreed upon by the House and the Senate committee are the same. I believe we should send this matter to conference, not necessarily with the idea of ultimately cutting down the appropriation, but of keeping control of the situation so that we can see what is going to be built in this time of crisis. The Senate committee approved these ships prior to the Korean crisis. If we put this matter into conference by this reduction, we can work out the question of what kind of ships should be built, and keep control of it in Congress.

If my understanding is correct, and we approve the committee action, as I did approve it in the subcommittee, we will have no more control over what ships shall be built, we will leave it entirely to the Maritime Commission and the administration to decide.

Mr. President, I believe we should keep our control on this subject up to the last minute.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, and then I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask whether or not the evidence shows that

the contracts have been let on the two South American vessels for the South American service?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is sure these vessels are not for our war effort, is he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my memory of the testimony is correct, they are newer, faster passenger ships, for the trade with South America.

Mr. FERGUSON. The one vessel that was to carry trailers from Los Angeles to San Francisco, and back and forth, would not be considered a defense vessel, would it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It might be considered a defense vessel. It could be used for carrying tanks, and that sort of thing, if a war came. As I understand, they take the trailer aboard in San Francisco, and put a new mule on it in Los Angeles.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it not be used for shipments to and from San Francisco? It is for the local traffic, is it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is for local traffic, but it could be used in time of war by being taken over by the Navy. That is my understanding, but I may be wrong.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is mistaken in his idea of the amendment which is under consideration. We would be taking this matter out of the hands of the conferees by supporting the amendment. We are dealing with the language which appears in italics on page 326, line 17. Of the amount there, \$5,500,000 has already been obligated for certain cargo prototype ships, and \$1,100,000 has been assigned to some other work. Of course, there are the two trailer ships to be run by the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. This appropriation was carried in last year's appropriation bill at a very much larger sum, but the committee in approving it did so with the purpose of taking the matter to conference, where we could then decide exactly how much was needed.

I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that in voting to reject the committee amendment he would merely be voting to deprive the Senate and the Congress of the opportunity to examine the whole matter in conference, as we had intended to do. The vessels of which the Senator spoke to me earlier in the evening are covered in an appropriation item on the previous page. So this is evidence that we are legislating by guesswork, and I suggest to Members of the Senate that it is much better and much wiser to accept the judgment of the committee, and work the matter out in conference.

The argument here would seem to convey the impression that the members of the committee were not concerned with saving money for the United States; that they were concerned only in making appropriations which could be wasted by a Maritime Commission no longer in

existence, which has been reorganized out of existence. Whereas the committee was motivated solely by the idea of providing the funds by which the United States should acquire the maritime fleet necessary in the judgment of the legislative committees for the national defense.

The amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. No Member of this body has a higher regard for the great Committee on Appropriations than I have, and no Member of this body has any deeper consciousness of the need for every provision for the national defense. As I understand, we are voting on a motion to reduce the amount of an authorization in the bill, and we are doing so after the evidence has been brought before us that the agency to which the authorization is being made has told a Member of the body that they are unable to commit the \$64,000,000 either within the 12 months for which the appropriation is made, or to give the committee or the Senate information as to what they would do with it if the money were made available to them.

The Senator from Oklahoma asked the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] if that was correct, and if information was before him that this amount was in excess of that which the agency had advised him they were either able to spend or to contract within the fiscal period. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee replied that that was a very pertinent question, for which he complimented the Senator, and then he ignored it. I see no reason, Mr. President, to vote for an authorization with reference to which the agency to which it is authorized is unable to spend it or commit it in the period for which it is made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that when he asked me that question, for which I complimented him, he was talking about an altogether different section of the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee may have misunderstood the Senator from Oklahoma, but his statement just made has to be either a misunderstanding or a statement based on the wrong impression.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the great Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator spoke of the amendment as an authorization. It is not an authorization at all. It is an appropriation of cash.

Mr. KERR. Then the answer goes to the amount of the cash, because the agency has said it can neither spend it nor contract for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know that our shipping capacity today is less than it was at the beginning of World War II

after Pearl Harbor? Does the Senator realize the deplorable condition of our shipping? How does the Senator figure that we can raise more troops, spend more money, prepare for war across many seas, over great distances, and neglect the important point of shipping? How can the Senator reconcile those great differences?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not understand the wisdom either of authorizing or appropriating money to an agency which says it can neither spend it nor contract for it within the period for which it is made. With reference to its being an appropriation or an authorization, as I read the language of the bill, it is:

That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority—

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator read the testimony which has been furnished him to the effect that the agency will not use this money? There was no such testimony before the committee. I am wondering where the Senator obtained the testimony.

Mr. KERR. I believe the Senator was on the floor when the letter was read, and if it was inaccurate, the chairman of the committee has not so advised the Senate or the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield the floor, and the Senator from Wyoming may claim it in his own right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that a few moments ago I told the Senator that he was talking about a different amendment from that about which he was talking when he addressed his inquiry to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is probably the best judge of what he had in his mind both when he addressed the question to the Senator from Wyoming and when he addressed his remarks to the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not altogether certain about that matter.

Mr. KERR. Then let me assure the Senator from Wyoming that I accord him the privilege of telling this body what is in his mind, and I reserve the privilege of telling the Senate what is in my mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question or two: Did he address an inquiry to me which was based upon the letter of Mr. Koehler, which was read by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KERR. It was related to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have a copy of it in my hand now and I will read from the letter:

Reference is made to your letter of June 29, 1950, concerning an item of \$63,000,000 in the 1951 appropriation bill.

The Senator is talking about an item of \$64,875,000.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The two items have to be considered together, the authorization for \$63,000,000 made by the House, and the additional authorization of \$64,875,000 made by the Senate committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That might be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or a total of \$127,875,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very good.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the total possible appropriations for ships which the Maritime Commission, according to its own statement, can consider, would be \$86,000,000, or \$41,000,000 less than the sum total in these two features.

Since we at present are considering only committee amendments, and it is not appropriate at this time to consider House language, my amendment strikes out the committee authorization by reducing it by \$41,100,000 in order to bring the global or total sum provided on pages 325 and 326 to the maximum amount which the Maritime Administration, according to its own statement, says it can spend, namely \$86,775,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is precisely the point to which I am addressing myself. It is highly technical. It indicates the difficulty of coming to an understanding about matters of this kind in a hectic debate upon the floor of the Senate. But the issue arose here: "Where is the evidence that the money is not to be expended?" The evidence was the letter of Mr. Koehler. That is the evidence that was cited by the Senator from Illinois. All in the world I am saying is that the Senator's inquiry to Mr. Koehler, and Mr. Koehler's reply refer solely to an item on page 325, whereas we are now discussing an amendment on page 326.

It might be advisable to cut appropriations. I am not discussing that question now. But I am merely pointing out the confusion to which the debate has led. I cite that confusion as evidence of the fact that in my judgment the Senate would do much better to trust the judgment of its committee and take this matter to conference than merely to cut the appropriation on the basis of an argument which is obviously not based on evidence.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The statement by the Senator from Wyoming respecting the amount of page 326 is entirely correct. I thought we were dealing with page 325, and that this item will be taken to conference, will be considered in conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to have the Senator say that. So I say let us vote down the amendment, and take the matter to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amount in line 17, page 326, is a carry-over. It is a carry-over of both kinds of funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would prefer to say "extension."

Mr. FERGUSON. At any rate, the money is now committed for that purpose, and they have the money.

I think the Senator from Illinois is correct in saying that if we cut that figure, our action will be the same as cutting the figure on page 325.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. We thus reduce somewhat the total amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, we reduce somewhat the total amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think the testimony on page 180 indicates that these contracts are not let at the present time, because Mr. Marshall said:

The budget presentation, Mr. Chairman, was to provide for the construction of either two or three combination passenger-cargo vessels for use in the North Atlantic, East Coast, South American trade, to be purchased by Moore-McCormack Lines with a construction differential subsidy.

They are not even sure whether the Moore-McCormack Lines will purchase them, at the present time. Certainly they will have no connection with the war effort at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 326, in line 17.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, of course there is some point to the remarks made by the Senator from Wyoming to the effect that there are two items here, one in line 17, on page 325, in the amount of \$63,000,000, which should be a new appropriation for the construction of new commercial ships, not defense ships, but new commercial ships for passenger traffic, in the main; and one of the next page, page 326, where there is an almost equal item—in the amount of \$64,875,000—that being a limitation on the amounts previously appropriated in the 1950 act to be permitted to be expended for a particular subject, namely, the construction of new ships, including reconditioning, betterment, and so forth.

The Senator from Illinois has addressed his amendment to a proposed reduction which certainly is justified on the basis of the specific statement of the Acting Administrator of the Maritime Commission. The amendment is certainly justified by that statement. The Senator has addressed his amendment to the latter amount, rather than to the former one.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, if the Senator from Tennessee will not permit me to make my statement on this matter without interruption.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the proviso on page 326, to which reference has been made. Objection has been made on the ground that these ships will not be built because the appropriation will expire at the end of the fiscal year.

However, the language there is:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in

the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950.

So that extends the time, and therefore the ships can be built.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has said that these ships are to be used for commercial purposes. However, does the Senator think for a moment that every ship needed for the transportation of troops or for other military purposes will not be converted, if conversion is necessary, just as was done in World War I and in World War II? Does the Senator think that the ships needed for such purpose will be used for other purposes?

As was well pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who has given careful consideration to this matter, our supply of ships now is smaller than it was at the beginning of World War II.

So I simply cannot understand the Senator's argument that these ships would not be available and valuable for national-defense purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Arizona. If he were correct in his understanding—but he is not—that this appropriation would be used for defense shipping, I would be in there pitching with him. However, the Senator from Arizona is incorrect in his understanding. No mere statement on the floor of the Senate that this particular appropriation is a defense appropriation makes it so. This is not by any manner or means a defense appropriation.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment is addressed to a carry-over from an appropriation made in 1950. It could more properly have been addressed to the appropriation of \$63,000,000 proposed to be made this year. In either case, it would not have been a defense appropriation, because in either case it was an appropriation for the building or the reconditioning of merchant vessels; and instead of being a defense appropriation, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that it is crystal clear from the statement of the Acting Administrator that some of this item is actually defense in reverse, as was stated by the Senator from Illinois, because it is proposed to spend \$9,500,000 in converting ships now available for troop transportation, ships which were built for use as troop transports, and to convert them into use as commercial liners. So instead of having accomplished something in the national defense, we would have gone in reverse, away from national defense.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to say again to the Senate—because I think every Senator wishes to support defense appropriations and defense spending and planning—that this particular appropriation is not a defense appropriation.

In making this statement, I address myself again to the distinguished Senator from Colorado. This appropriation is one addressed to the last amount mentioned, which is a carry over from 1950, or to the first amount mentioned—the amount of \$63,000,000. In either case the appropriation is not a defense appropriation. To the contrary, it is an appropriation for the construction of commercial vessels or for the conversion of troop ships into commercial ships.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me ask whether he is referring to the construction of the vessels *General Pope* and *General Weigel*.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe that is what is involved. I do not believe the Senator was present when this matter was first discussed.

Let me say that I do not believe this is an occasion for heat; and if I appear to be heated, certainly I do not mean to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. However, the Senator from Illinois tells me that this item relates to the *General Pope* and *General Weigel*.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, they represent a part of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But those ships have been ordered out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the fact is that this has to do with two items, one appropriated in 1950—and certainly it was not a defense appropriation—and the other proposed to be appropriated this year, on the basis of a budget submitted last fall, and certainly that item is not a defense appropriation.

The best proof of the fact that it is not a defense appropriation is the letter obtained by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] specifically answering special questions with reference to what was proposed to be done with the \$63,000,000 item of newly requested funds under the appropriation bill to go into effect at the beginning of the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, I shall not weary the Senate by rereading each of those provisions. However, it will be found that in answering the questions, the Acting Administrator stated to the Senator from Illinois that the vessels which were to be covered by the contract authority, under the \$63,000,000, were new vessels for the "Good Neighbor Fleet" vessels to replace some vessels now 20 years old, operating along the east coast of South America.

The second question was:

Have any formal applications been filed by the companies who would benefit from this contract authority?

The answer was:

No formal applications have been filed for the construction of passenger vessels by any company or companies for operation on Trade Route No. 1. Further in this connection, see answer to question No. "4," appearing hereinafter.

Mr. President, under those first two questions, the plan is to construct two new ships for the "Good Neighbor Fleet," to operate along the east coast of South America, in the Atlantic Ocean; and it is said that up to the time of the writing of that letter on July, no application for

replacement ships had been filed by any of the companies which now are using the 20-year-old ships. So this item is proposed in connection with looking a good long way ahead.

The next question was:

According to present calculations, is it reasonable to assume that these contracts will be let before June 30, 1951?

In other words, before the end of the fiscal year for which the appropriation bill now before the Senate is to be passed. I particularly call this matter to the attention of Senators, Mr. President.

The answer was:

At the time our 1951 budget was filed, it was believed that it would be possible to execute contracts for the construction and sale to a private company of the necessary passenger-carrying vessels to replace the "Good Neighbor Fleet." Our latest and very recent estimate is that contracts with respect to such new vessels cannot be awarded until about November 1, 1951.

That is after this fiscal year has passed and the fall of next fiscal year is at hand.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. What is the date of the letter containing that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. The date of the letter is July 18, 1950, and it is written by the Acting Administrator of the Maritime Commission to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, replying to specific questions; and those questions were designed to bring out—I call this to the attention of the Senate—whether this was defense construction; if so, how soon it could be gotten under way; and, if it was not defense construction, then what type it was, and how soon they would expect to get that under way. If there ever was a clear showing of the fact that this is not defense construction but is a construction project for the future, and some of it for the very remote future, a construction of commercial liners, not at all designed to take part in the defense effort, of course, this letter is crystal clear on both those points.

I shall not continue to read the rest of the information that is in the letter. It is perfectly clear, at least to the junior Senator from Florida, that the wise thing to do is to lay the predicate for a real conference on the amount—I emphasize, on the amount—between the House and the Senate.

So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, if by the time this bill is in conference there are items of proposed defense construction or proposed defense conversion—reminding Senators again that the conversion here is nondefense, it is away from defense—if there are specific items which can be approved by the conference committee in its judgment, of course the Senate I am sure will want to approve them, and the entire Congress will want to approve them.

We are being asked here to approve the extension of a large number of peacetime appropriations made last year, for the fiscal year 1950, and a great deal of new appropriation proposed to be made this year for peacetime construction and peacetime conversion. I say to the Sen-

ate that instead of being a defense measure, this is operating in reverse, exactly as the Senator from Illinois has said, and that it seems to me that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has indeed put his finger on the real prospect of getting something constructive out of this; that is, to take this amendment to conference and insist upon there working out a defense program for Maritime Commission conversion, and, if necessary, construction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say that if the amendment of the Senator from Illinois goes to conference, the \$64,000,000 item will not then be in conference. The only thing that will be in conference will be the \$23,000,000; and the House has already fixed it at that sum. The conference will be able to do nothing with it. The Senator is just not familiar with it. The members of the committee who had it in charge were familiar with it. They worked hard on it. They gave their best judgment to the matter, and the full committee, regardless of whether they were Democrats or Republicans, overwhelmingly voted to report the committee amendment; and now we find Senators who voted in committee to report the bill, with this amount, now opposing it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I share the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. I may say, however, I think some Senators on this floor know a little more about this appropriation than the distinguished Senator seems to think. We know that the 1950 appropriation was a peacetime appropriation for peacetime work, and we know that the budget submitted last year for appropriation this year was again a peacetime budget for peacetime construction. We also know the letter which is before the Senate, and the facts in it are within the knowledge of every Senator. Every Senator in his own conscience must have knowledge that this program is a peacetime program, that it is a civilian program, and that, so far as defense is concerned, it operates in reverse.

We have an official statement from the Acting Administrator to the effect that a large part of this appropriation cannot be employed, the contracts cannot even be made until November 1951, and other large parts of it, parts relating to conversion, have to do with conversion in reverse, from troop ships into commercial carriers. We also know, Mr. President and Senators, that if we are in a critical defense situation—and certainly we have many reasons to make us think so—any construction of large peacetime liners is not going to be permitted; they are not going to be laid down; they are not going to be constructed, because the shipyards are going to be utilized in repairing, rehabilitating, reconditioning, and converting the large number of ships laid up and

available but not now of course ready to be used overnight.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida to turn to page 326 of the bill, where in line 17, he will see the item to which the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is directed. The Senator will observe that that item is in italics. All that item, from line 4 down to line 21, will be in conference, and by any amendment that the Senate now makes with respect to that figure, we shall be reducing the area of the conference. The Senator from Massachusetts was of the opinion that we were dealing with a provision which the House had passed, but when I called his attention to the fact, he saw that it was an amendment added by the Senate committee, and that the elimination of this amendment would be removing the matter from conference.

Now, I can understand a Senator's voting to reduce an appropriation; I can understand arguments that may be made for that. But I want to assure the Senator from Florida, and all who have listened to his very eloquent argument, that if, as he said a moment ago, it is a constructive thing to take this matter to conference, then the only way to do it is to allow the amount reported by the Senate committee to remain in the bill.

Of course, if it is reduced—I must be quite frank, then the amount that may be allowed will remain in conference. But if Senators think we are wasting money, or trying to waste money, I should like to read some of the other language of this amendment: Beginning in line 4 I read:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless, in either case, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

I am pointing that out because I want the Senate to realize that its committee has been endeavoring to protect the Treasury.

I do not pretend, Mr. President, that we are building warships. When I read the showing with respect to defense, I was not pretending we were building troop ships. But I say to the Senator from Florida, and to every other Senator, that by the degree we build up communication by sea with other areas and other lands, we shall be serving the interests of the United States. The fund which would be provided by the \$64,875,000 would cover the following items: Some passenger vessels for the Caribbean service; two trailer ships for the Pacific coast.

The Senator from California pointed out to us that with respect to those trailer ships for the Pacific coast, through no fault of the shipowners, the contracts were delayed, and they asked specific action by the committee not to make it available for 12 months, but to make it available until December 31, 1950.

So, Mr. President, we can act wisely and intelligently only by a parliamentary method. Arguments may be made for the reduction of an appropriation which the House approved and the Senate did not touch but such an amendment would go to conference, of course, and would fall into an utterly different category from that of this amendment; and if we strike it out, we deprive the conferees of the opportunity of determining whether the money should be spent for those vessels.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator has fallen into error, and if he will follow me I believe he will see that I am correct.

The House bill does not end with the \$63,000,000 figure on line 17, but has itself a proviso somewhat of the same nature, covering the same subject matter of the committee amendment down to line 17. But on line 17, the Senate committee, and I think it was very wise, began to treat as one great, going matter the business of the Nation, with the hold-over or carry-over appropriation from last year with the proposed new one for this year. There is, of course, some change in the proviso, and I should not want to be considered as saying that there is not. There is some change in the first part of the amendment over the House provision, but the second part of the amendment is entirely new matter, so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The result of making this reduction would be to cut down the amount of the carry-over, or that part of it which would be applied to new construction, by the amount which is so clearly shown by the letter of the Acting Administrator to be not needed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the Senate would be taking that much commerce from the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems clear to the junior Senator from Florida that while that amendment could very properly have been addressed to the \$63,000,000, and while, in his judgment, as he stated a while ago, that would have been the preferable place to apply it, at the same time, that was not pending. The matter pending was the adoption of a proposed committee amendment which, if it were adopted and the House provision left undisturbed, would have provided for \$63,000,000 plus a carry-over of \$64,875,000 for new construction, which is not, by any stretch of the imagination, defense construction.

It seems clear that the item which the letter from the Acting Administrator says is not needed, which does not apply to defense, and will not be used because the contracts cannot be let, according to his letter, until 1951, should be omitted. So there are left in the lap of the confer-

ence committee two things: First, what the specific provision shall be as to the limitations based on the \$63,000,000; and, second, how much of the preceding carry-over appropriation shall be left available for new construction. It seems to me there is no question about that, and, so far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, without further debate he is perfectly willing to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator says that by no stretch of the imagination can this appropriation be considered a defense measure. All the ships as they are constructed must, in every case, be approved by the Navy. I am sure that if the Secretary of the Navy were here tonight and were permitted to testify on the floor, he would say to the Senate, "These are the kinds of ships we need—fast, new, modern ships, which can be converted to the carriage of troops." I am sure that is exactly what he would say. I do not believe he would agree with the Senator from Florida that by no stretch of the imagination can they be considered defense ships. They are certainly defense ships. They are approved by the Navy in each case, and they cannot be constructed unless the Navy approves them.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, despite the desire of Senators to vote, I should like to have some information. The purpose is to provide for the reconditioning and repair of vessels, in other words, the so-called Liberty ships. I should like to know whether this amount of money is for new construction or whether all or a part of it is to be used for the purpose of repair or renovation of ships now lying in dock and which are not in a good state of repair.

Mr. HOLLAND. In reply to the Senator, I would say that the portion of the construction provided for under the 1950 appropriation act, which is stated in the letter to which I have referred, does not touch the item the Senator has mentioned, but, instead, relates to various passenger vessels for the Grace Line and trailer ships for the Pacific coast. It has no relation whatever to the subject matter which he mentions.

I think the Senator has put his finger on exactly the same question on which the Senator from Massachusetts put his finger, namely, that by adopting this amendment we can leave it in the discretion of the conference committee, with the guidance which it will have from the Maritime Commission and the Navy, to convert the program, in as great an amount as it can be converted, into a defense program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what the Senator from Minnesota wanted to know.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator by reading the law. The Senator will not take my opinion; he will take the law. The trouble with this debate is that we

talk without facts and do not depend upon the law. The amendment which is before the Senate is as follows:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950.

I have in my hand Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress, and I read from it as follows:

New ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, as authorized by title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (except for construction of two prototype vessels under title VII of said act), \$26,875,000, of which \$12,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted under this head in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for new ship construction an amount not to exceed \$75,000,000; and in addition, the Commission is authorized to enter into contracts for new ship construction in an amount not to exceed \$50,000,000.

So the amendment now before the Senate would provide the authority for \$14,000,000 for reconditioning and betterment, and \$50,000,000 for new construction. That can be any sort of construction the Government may deem essential in the present crisis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator is saying that we can use \$14,000,000 of the \$64,000,000 for the purpose of repairing the Naval Reserve ships.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or \$14,000,000 of the \$23,000,000, which would be provided under my amendment. So the reconditioning of ships would be taken care of under my amendment as well as under the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And \$50,000,000 for new construction, which may be very essential.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I invite the attention of the Presiding Officer to page 326, line 17, to the figure "\$64,875,000." If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is agreed to, and \$23,775,000 is substituted for the \$64,875,000, what amount would go to conference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the conferees could not consider a greater amount than is included in the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, if adopted by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out, in the light of the question asked by the Senator from Minnesota, that the Reserve Fleet is covered on page 330, line 1:

Reserve Fleet expenses, \$8,978,600.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 326, line 17. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY],

the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Holland	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Humphrey	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kem	Stennis
Douglas	Kerr	Taft
Eastland	McCarthy	Thye
Eaton	Malone	Tobey
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Gurney	Mundt	Wiley
Hendrickson	Robertson	Williams

NAYS—37

Anderson	Ives	Maybank
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chavez	Kilgore	Neely
Darby	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Langer	Pepper
Frear	Lehman	Russell
Graham	Lodge	Saltonstall
Green	McCarran	Sparkman
Hayden	McClellan	Tydings
Hill	McFarland	Young
Hoey	McKellar	
Hunt	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—29

Benton	Fulbright	Millikin
Brewster	George	Murray
Butler	Gillette	O'Connor
Cain	Jenner	Taylor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Kefauver	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Leahy	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Long	Wherry
Ellender	Lucas	Withers
Flanders	Magnuson	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether the amendment which I offered to the provision on page 326, line 17, has been rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire whether it would be appropriate, after the consideration of committee amendments has been concluded, to offer the same amendment to the House appropriation of \$63,000,000 on line 17, page 325, of the House text?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That language would be open to amendment after the committee amendments have all been completed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall offer the amendment at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 326, line 17. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, does that complete the committee amendments in this chapter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments in this chapter, and up to page 358.

INVITATION TO SENATORS TO VISIT WILLIAMSBURG

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the executive vice president of the Jamestown Corp., Mr. Allan R. Matthews, in which he extends a very cordial invitation to all Members of the Senate to come to Williamsburg next Sunday, July 30, at the fourth annual legislative day, to be the guests of the corporation for the beautiful historic pageant, The Common Glory. Each Senator who can go will be furnished with two free tickets to the pageant. The letter states that ample accommodations can be secured for those who wish to spend the night in Williamsburg. Any Senator who wishes to take advantage of this offer should let me know, so that I can make reservations for the tickets to the pageant.

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

THE JAMESTOWN CORP.,

Williamsburg, Va., July 24, 1950.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: On July 30, 1950, the Jamestown Corp., in cooperation with the Governor of Virginia, will be host at its fourth annual legislative day, a day which commemorates the date on which the Virginia House of Burgesses, the first freely elected governing body on the North American Continent came into existence.

In observance of the day, the General Assembly of Virginia will hold a commemorative session at the Old Jamestown Church at Jamestown Island, site of the first permanent English colony on this continent. Speakers will include Vice Admiral J. Leslie Hall, former Commandant of the Fifth Naval District, and Virginia's Governor Battle.

After that meeting, members of the general assembly and other guests will participate in a picnic-box supper on the grounds at Jamestown, and at 8:15 p. m., that day, the same group will be guests of the Jamestown Corp. at a performance of Paul Green's

historical drama, *The Common Glory*, which tells the story of American Colonies' fight for independence.

In view of the nature of the observance and of the significance at this time of the drama's message, the Jamestown Corp. will be happy if you will invite your colleagues in the United States Senate to attend both the commemorative session and the performance of the play and we earnestly hope many of them will be able to be present. We should like to hear from those who plan to come in order that arrangements may be made for their suppers. Two complimentary tickets to *The Common Glory* will be set aside at our box office for each Senator who is able to be here.

For your information, I am notified that sufficient space is available at the Williamsburg Inn on Sunday to accommodate those who would like to remain overnight in Williamsburg.

Looking forward to having you with us on Sunday, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN R. MATTHEWS,
Executive Vice President.

MISSION OF STANLEY EARL TO KOREA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask to have an editorial inserted in the *RECORD*, and have a minute or two to explain the insertion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the *RECORD* an editorial which appeared in the *Portland Oregonian* of July 21, 1950, entitled "Mr. Earl's Mission."

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

MR. EARL'S MISSION

It has been inevitable that Stanley Earl, of Portland, returning from his duties with the Economic Cooperation Administration in Korea and speaking out with admirable frankness on the conditions which have existed in South Korea and which have abetted Communist penetration, should be quoted and misquoted in the Communist press of the United States and the world.

This page also, having pointed out in a number of editorials that all was not well below the thirty-eighth parallel, has been quoted and misquoted by the rats among us who lie in wait for such opportunity.

Mr. Earl's position seems to be exactly the position which this page has taken—that the laboratory test of war has shown that we had neglected reform during our period of Korean occupancy and that consequently there was no loyalty for us among the masses of the people. These people had, and have, no desire for communism. Generally speaking, they appear to detest it. But they have been under a police state from which American occupancy had failed to release them, and apathy has been the result.

This is unsavory stuff, but it is material that all of us need to assimilate, and particularly our Government. We have to make the decision as to whether, when we go back into command of Korea, we are going to make democracy a true force for reform. Or is it to be a repetition of our lending ourselves to what Mr. Earl has described as a police state.

Mr. Earl has been called to Washington. We hope he continues to tell the facts as he sees them. It is a mission of the highest patriotism.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in regard to this editorial, that Mr. Earl, an Oregonian, was appointed some months ago as the representative of ECA in behalf of the labor mission of ECA in Korea.

Mr. Earl found conditions in South Korea very unsatisfactory so far as the free-labor movement was concerned, and upon his return to the United States some days ago he made some statements in an interview with a newspaper correspondent of the *Portland Oregonian* concerning conditions in South Korea as he found them to be. The *Daily Worker* picked up Mr. Earl's comments and gave widespread publicity to them, seeking, of course, to give the impression that Mr. Earl was in effect a witness for the Communist position in Korea. This editorial of the *Portland Oregonian* goes to that question.

Mr. President, I desire to say that I have known Mr. Stanley Earl for a great many years. He is an avowed enemy of everything communistic. He has fought the Communists in the CIO, both in Oregon and in the country generally. He is known as a labor leader within the right wing of the CIO. I happen to know that his appointment as a labor representative for the labor mission in Korea by ECA had the support of the A. F. of L. and of the CIO, and when he spoke in South Korea he spoke for the American labor movement, the CIO, the A. F. of L., the brotherhoods, indeed, the entire American labor movement.

Any criticism of Mr. Earl because of any statement he has made in regard to conditions as he found them in South Korea is not justified on the basis of any ground that Mr. Earl in any sense is the least bit sympathetic to communism. It is true that as we read his interview—and I understand it is also true if we will read some of the reports which Mr. Earl during the past few months has sent back to ECA and the State Department—we discover he found some conditions in South Korea in need of great improvement, just as the junior Senator from Oregon some time ago on the floor of the Senate tried to forewarn the Senate with regard to some of the internal conditions in South Korea which needed the immediate attention of the United States, which they did not get, but, instead, apparently we withdrew from Korea, when, in my judgment, we should have been moving into Korea with both military aid and economic aid. Our failure to do so raises a question which calls for an answer, in my opinion, on the part of the State Department.

Let me say, in this great hour of crisis, as one who is going to give unlimited support to the administration in meeting the crisis, that I am not going to justify any of the mistakes in Korea, and particularly the mistakes of the State Department, which I think helped augment the seriousness of the situation in which we now find ourselves in Korea.

For my part, I am glad there was someone in the Korean Mission who, when he returned to the United States, in an interview with an Oregonian correspondent spoke out and told what he found to be the conditions in Korea.

It behooves us to take steps now to see to it, not only in Korea, but in some other parts of the world where we find ourselves coming to the assistance of some very reactionary governments, that

American principles are put into operation, so that we will not have a repetition of some of the causes of the Korean crisis which now confronts us, causes which are leading now to the death of American boys in Korea.

Mr. President, it is a pretty serious matter when we find that conditions existed in South Korea as they did exist prior to this conference.

I want the *RECORD* to show that I enthusiastically support the finding which the *Portland Oregonian* hands down in its discussion of Mr. Earl's mission, when it defends his Americanism, and when it points out very clearly that he is anti-Communist not only in his beliefs, but in his whole record as a labor leader in the United States.

THE CASE OF MR. KRIPS—EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the *RECORD* two editorials, both entitled "The Case of Mr. Krips," one from the *New York Times* of July 21, and the other from the *New York Herald Tribune* of July 20. I shall read the concluding portion of both of them.

At this time there is a great deal of talk about rearming western Germany. Yet when two of the outstanding men of Germany and Austria come to the United States they are met by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and sent back by the Department of Justice, without one single word of testimony being introduced against them. How do Senators suppose the German people felt when Walter Giesinger was sent back? How do Senators suppose the Austrian people felt when the great Austrian musician, Mr. Krips was sent back to Austria? The editorials will give some idea of what these great newspapers, the *New York Herald Tribune* and the *New York Times*, think about it. I read the last paragraph of the editorial from the *Herald Tribune* as follows:

There is no excuse for someone to be granted permission to come here on one side of the ocean and be deprived of it on the other. When as in this case, the person involved is a man of eminence, the affair makes America appear downright ridiculous. Surely some explanation is due in the case of Mr. Krips, and possibly an apology as well.

I read the last paragraph of the *New York Times* editorial as follows:

Rumor, hearsay, slander—these may be the bases on which an alien is excluded, and under our present practice he may not merely have no chance to fight back but he may not even know the nature of the charges. This is an outrageously undemocratic procedure. It demands revision. Surely, if they put their minds to it, Congress and the State and Justice Departments could work out a better and more democratic method of protecting the security of the United States against aliens suspected of subversion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials may be printed at this point in the body of the *RECORD*.

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

[From the New York Times of July 21, 1950]

THE CASE OF MR. KRIPS

Refusal of the authorities to reveal why they barred Josef Krips, conductor of the Vienna State Opera, from entering the United States is the latest but not the worst in a long series of incidents that have made certain aspects of our immigration procedure look little short of ridiculous.

Josef Krips was scheduled to make his American debut leading the Chicago Symphony Orchestra Tuesday night, and to return to Austria within a few days. He received his visa from the American consul in Vienna without trouble; but on arrival here Sunday was detained without explanation by the immigration authorities for further investigation. Rather than wait at Ellis Island for the investigation to be completed, with the possibility that he would be deported without a hearing anyway, Mr. Krips decided to return to Europe without further ado. The upshot of this case is that no one—except perhaps the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department—knows why he was barred from this country, nothing has been proved for or against him, a blot is inferentially left on his record, and an American audience has been deprived of becoming acquainted with a gifted conductor.

There is no question but that the Attorney General and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are acting within the law. The Attorney General has the power to deny admission to the United States of any alien whose presence he feels would be prejudicial to the interests of this country, and to deny admission without a hearing. But there is a very large question as to the wisdom of refusing to hold such a hearing, except perhaps in the most extreme emergency. What we are doing is to say to aliens who seek access to our shores that our democracy functions for everyone within our borders, but our democratic principles do not necessarily apply to those knocking at the gates.

Rumor, hearsay, slander—these may be the bases on which an alien is excluded, and under our present practice he may not merely have no chance to fight back but he may not even know the nature of the charges. This is an outrageously undemocratic procedure. It demands revision. Surely, if they put their minds to it, Congress and the State and Justice Departments could work out a better and more democratic method of protecting the security of the United States against aliens suspected of subversion.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1950]

THE CASE OF MR. KRIPS

The departure from these shores of Joseph Krips, conductor of the Vienna Opera, points up anew the curious lack of liaison that exists between the State Department and the Justice Department when it comes to allowing foreigners into the United States. Mr. Krips was invited here to conduct the Chicago Symphony Orchestra; he received a visa from the American Embassy in Vienna. Yet when he arrived he was taken to Ellis Island and told he must either depart voluntarily or else be detained pending an investigation of certain unspecified information against him. Mr. Krips, who shortly will begin to conduct at the Salzburg Festival in Austria, chose to leave.

Mr. Krips obviously is no Nazi. He evidently was one of the few conductors with clean enough hands to be allowed to lead the Vienna Philharmonic immediately after the liberation; he has taken it on tour of all western Europe; he has achieved wide popularity in England; his phonograph

records are well known here. He conducted in Russia in 1947 under the auspices of the Austrian Government, and in the absence of any statement by the Immigration authorities, it must be presumed that this is the stumbling block to his admission. If this is so, the people who want to hear this musician perform are entitled to have the objection specified, so that they may judge its validity for themselves. There is no excuse for someone to be granted permission to come here on one side of the ocean and be deprived of it on the other. When, as in this case, the person involved is a man of eminence, the affair makes America appear downright ridiculous. Surely some explanation is due in the case of Mr. Krips, and possibly an apology as well.

THE WRECK OF A ST. LOUIS-BOUND FRISCO TRAIN—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday we heard a great deal from the junior Senator from South Dakota about the Mundt-Nixon bill. He said that one of the reasons we should immediately act upon the bill was that there had been a train wreck, he first said, in Maine, but when the distinguished Senator from Missouri rose and reminded him it must have been in Missouri, then the Senator from South Dakota changed the location to Missouri. But time and again during his speech he referred to the train wreck, and suggested that, in his opinion, subversive elements caused the wreck. I have here the Washington Times-Herald of this morning, in which there is an article entitled "Boy Confesses Train Wreck." The article is from Holland, Mo., July 24, and reads in part as follows:

Pemiscot County authorities arrested a 15-year-old sharecropper's son today and said he has admitted throwing a switch which caused the wreck of a St. Louis-bound Frisco lines train yesterday.

That is the first paragraph of the item, Mr. President. It all goes to show that in a time of hysteria, anything which may happen anywhere in the United States, no matter how bad, may be blamed on some organization or some person who is not at all guilty. To my mind what was said yesterday is a perfect example of what happens in a time of hysteria.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

BOY CONFESSES TRAIN WRECK

HOLLAND, Mo., July 24.—Pemiscot County authorities arrested a 15-year-old sharecropper's son today and said he has admitted throwing a switch which caused the wreck of a St. Louis-bound Frisco-lines train yesterday.

The train's engineer, Ira H. Woods, was killed and the fireman seriously injured when the locomotive struck the open switch. Thirteen passengers were slightly injured.

The boy reportedly told officers that he got the idea of wrecking the train from a moving picture he had seen. He said he stole a saw and threw it in a field after using it to saw the lock on the switch Saturday afternoon.

The saw was recovered when the boy led investigators to the scene.

He was taken to jail at Caruthersville pending the filing of formal charges.

BILLS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in connection with the call of the calendar tomorrow may I ask the Senator from Arizona whether there has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of bills which will be called, which appear on the calendar prior to the point at which the call of the calendar was ended on the last call?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes; such a list was ordered printed in the RECORD earlier today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

RECESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 25, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose resources of grace are inexhaustible and abundantly adequate, we pray that we may be numbered among the seekers and finders of God, for we need Thee so greatly and desperately in all the strange and various experiences of each new day.

Thou hast given us victory in days gone by and we are committing and commending ourselves to Thy care and keeping in the days to come.

May we have the courage to believe that the kingdom of God, the kingdom of brotherhood, will be established upon the earth, and may we be eager to hasten the coming of that blessed day of prediction when peace and good will shall prevail everywhere.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday 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 July 22, 1950, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3532. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

BRITISH OIL POLICY IN CHINA

Mr. MEYER. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on July 17 I called attention of the House to the report from Hong Kong that the British Asiatic Petroleum Co. was continuing sales of petroleum products to Chinese Communists and in fact were expanding sales to fill some of the gap left when two American companies, Socony and Caltex, quit doing business on the Chinese mainland.

I now arise to call attention to the news report of July 18 to the effect that the British policy on oil sales to China had been reversed.

It is my hope that this will continue to be the policy of the British and of the companies which are under the influence of the British Government. In these critical days every precaution should be taken to see that no materials and supplies from the United States or any of the countries allied with the United States in the effort to confine communism should reach the forces arrayed against us.

TAXES, TAXES—WHERE TO GET THE MONEY

Mr. RICH. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman did not spell out a tax program in his speech, although he indicated that additional taxes should be raised in order to pay for this Korean war in which he has entered our country.

Now, his first suggestion should be that he eliminate his \$50,000 a year tax-exempt salary, which he receives in addition to his regular yearly salary of \$130,000 and \$40,000 expense money. He should also suggest the elimination of the \$20,000 a year tax-exempt expense money which the Vice President and the Speaker of the House receive. These items were included in the first bill the President of the United States signed in the early days of the Eighty-first Congress. The \$2,500 tax-free money all Members of the Congress receive in addition to their yearly salaries should also be taxed.

Let the pinch come to those who are behind this war and let them show that they are willing to lead the way. There is no better way to set an example to the people who are not responsible for this Korean expedition, as Mr. Truman calls it, but which seems to me to be a war of great magnitude. Let us lead the way in taxes, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include excerpts from a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, an illustration of the contradictions found in our foreign policy is found in the foreign exchange field. For example, from Canada, I am informed United States citizens are permitted to bring in only \$12,500 annually. At the very same time this administration can be expected to try to get Canada to participate more heavily in the present military effort in Korea by larger sharing in war contracts.

Certainly this ought to be an opportune time to secure exchange concessions from our neighbor on the north. Doubtless additional war contracts in Canada will ease the alleged dollar shortage there, and make possible much freer transfer of Canadian funds to the United States.

I feel sure there are thousands of American citizens who would like to withdraw capital from Canada, but cannot now do so.

In addition, relaxation of exchange controls would encourage investment in Canadian enterprises. Who will send capital there knowing they cannot get it back, except in small annual amounts?

Relaxation of exchange controls throughout the world, and especially in English-speaking countries, would be a real contribution to better economic conditions and greater international stability.

Under unanimous consent granted by the House, I include portions of a letter on this subject received from a constituent:

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: There is talk that Canada will obtain a bigger share of United States war contracts and certainly Canada will make a contribution in line with the Atlantic Pact.

In that event Canada will receive a large volume of dollar increase. This will enable her to buy American products needed for her own economy and she should ease foreign exchange regulations.

I am interested because I have been penalized due to Canadian foreign exchange regulations. * * * I am only allowed to export \$12,500 annually and I am seriously hampered due therefrom and would like the use of this capital in Iowa now.

There are thousands of people in the United States similarly situated who want to withdraw capital from Canada but are prevented due to Canadian Foreign Exchange Board regulations.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

Mr. SCUDDER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the United States Government today owns the dried equivalent of two dozen eggs for every man, woman, and child in the country. These eggs have been bought under a Department of Agriculture program designed to insure prosperity on the farms of this country through maintenance of high prices.

While the Agriculture Department has carried on this program, another Government department—the State Department—has continued its downward re-

vision of tariff rates on eggs, as well as on many other products. At Geneva 2 years ago, the 27-cents-a-pound duty on dried eggs was reduced to 17 cents. The 27-cent figure was established in 1931 after an investigation of foreign egg production costs.

What happened after this decrease in import duty? In 1948, the United States imported 235,061 pounds of dried eggs from China. The following year—1949—that figure shot up to 1,903,038 pounds. For the first 5 months of 1950, the United States imported 1,744,285 pounds of dried eggs from China. A Department of Agriculture circular forecasts an increase in these figures.

American dollars are pouring into that Soviet satellite while our own Government buys surplus American eggs and stores them in a Kansas cave. Every pound of Chinese dried and frozen eggs bought in this country decreases the purchases from American farmers on the open market. This increases the Government's purchases, boosts our taxes, and increases the farmer's reliance upon the Government for his livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, we can do two things to end this intolerable situation. We can—and we should—call upon the State Department to take immediate action to restore the tariff rate to its former level. And, as a safeguard against future situations of this kind in our entire import trade, we should enact my bill, H. R. 6902, to restore the peril point and escape clause to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This would protect the American farmer, producer, and worker from competition by the cheap labor markets of the world.

CURSE OF COMMUNISM

Mr. SMATHERS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, the curse of communism threatens the liberty of all people throughout the world. The job of fighting its tyranny belongs to every person and every country which desires to preserve democracy and freedom.

On June 24, when the Communists of North Korea inexcusably attacked the South Koreans, the United Nations promptly called on the Democratic countries of the world to join together and resist that aggression. The people of the United States responded to that call. Today our young men are fighting and dying in the cause of freedom. Today our resources are being mobilized for whatever sacrifice may lie ahead.

It is a deadly serious struggle that is taking place in Korea, and the time has now come when all the nations who wish to preserve their independence should begin to assume their proportionate share of the burden of resistance. I am sure that no one wishes to ask a nation to do that, which because of its lack of resources or limited manpower, it is incapable of doing, but we must remember that the free peoples of the world are faced with a common threat to their

liberty, and that they have a common task to perform.

Surely the sense of fairness which motivates the member nations of the United Nations will prompt them to make the same proportionate sacrifice in manpower and in resources as are the people of the United States.

We, here in America, are mobilizing our industry and our wealth; we are drafting our manpower, and the time has arrived when all the other countries of the United Nations believing in the ideals of freedom must take similar steps to ready themselves to meet their fair share of the job of turning back the Red forces of tyranny and oppression.

Let us hope that it will not be long before the combat troops of the various countries in the United Nations will be standing shoulder to shoulder as symbols of continuing democracy and freedom.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 658)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a Report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from October 1, 1949, to March 31, 1950, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 25, 1950.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and insert four separate articles by Frank C. Waldrop.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made before the American Road Builders Association.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in connection therewith.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently 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. 217]

Abbitt	Gamble	Norton
Allen, Ill.	Gary	O'Brien, Mich.
Allen, La.	Gillette	Passman
Anderson, Calif.	Gilmer	Pfeifer
Barden	Gordon	Joseph L.
Barrett, Wyo.	Gore	Pfeiffer
Bates, Mass.	Gwinn	William L.
Bennett, Fla.	Hall	Phillips, Tenn.
Bentsen	Edwin Arthur	Pickett
Boggs, La.	Hare	Plumley
Boykin	Harris	Powell
Breen	Hébert	Quinn
Brehm	Hill	Rains
Brooks	Hinshaw	Ramsay
Buckley, N. Y.	Irving	Regan
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Richards
Burton	Jackson	Roosevelt
Byrne, N. Y.	Jennings	Sabath
Carroll	Jensen	Sadowski
Cavalcante	Johnson	Sanborn
Chatham	Karst	Scott, Hardie
Chlperfield	Keefe	Sims
Christopher	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Ohio
Combs	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Cooper	Klein	Stanley
Corbett	Larcade	Sutton
Cox	Lucas	Tackett
Davies, N. Y.	McCarthy	Teague
Dawson	McGrath	Trimble
Dingell	McGuire	Vursell
Douglas	McMillen, Ill.	Wagner
Eaton	Madden	Welch
Engel, Mich.	Marcantonio	Werdel
Evins	Marshall	White, Idaho
Fogarty	Morrison	Wier
Frazier	Moulder	Willis
Fulton	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Furcolo	Murray, Wis.	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 315 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. VINSON. 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 (S. 3937) to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3937, with Mr. YOUNG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first measure to come before the House in response to the war in Korea. It is legislation of a type that Congress has previously enacted in similar times in World War I and World War II.

However, before discussing the bill, I want to make a few general observations on the present world situation as I see it.

To me it looks like our country is in this kind of shape.

Let us take the international picture first.

In international affairs, all the world today is a tinder box. Global war could begin at any time. Communist partisans have resorted to the use of arms in Korea and Indo-China. They have just conquered China. Malaya is in trouble. Burma is in trouble. Late news indicates that we may have trouble in Formosa, despite the President's warning to the Chinese Reds. Iran is a potential battlefield. The Balkans are, as usual, a powder keg. Border incidents are occurring all along between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Albania. Greece is being threatened. The Russians keep the pressure on in Berlin. The Germans in the eastern part of that nation are organized into a Red army of dangerous size.

Russia has, in effect, walked out of the United Nations. Russian propaganda is violently attacking all western nations. Despite the United Nations action in respect to Korea, Russia is apparently furnishing military assistance to the northern Koreans. A Russian fifth column is working actively in all of the free nations of the world.

So, in the international arena, there is dynamite everywhere. We could have a world-wide explosion at any time. And no one knows what may happen tomorrow.

I think the international picture is as grim as it was at any time in the late 1930's when Hitler and Mussolini and Japanese leaders were completing their plans for World War II.

And how about the military picture? It is not much more encouraging, to be frank about it.

Russia has almost 300 submarines. That is about six times as many as Nazi Germany had on the outbreak of World War II, and with her less than 50 submarines Germany almost ran us off the high seas before we could get our anti-submarine warfare well under way.

Russia has some 40,000 tanks. She outnumbered us in tanks at least by 7 to 1, and some of her tanks are far superior to ours.

Russia has some 175 ground divisions, as contrasted to our 10, with only one of our 10 at battle strength.

Russia has a vast air force well trained to work with the Russian ground forces. The tactical air support for our Army is notoriously weak, due mainly to our failure to carry forward our 70-group program for the American Air Force.

Russia is situated in an enviable strategic position. She is right on the edge of western Europe and can concentrate vast military power there much more rapidly than it can be provided from the United States. She has satellite armies rimming her whole border. She can use satellites here and there in the world—in Germany, in the Balkans, in the Near East, in Asia—and, if we let her, she can pin American forces down here and there to such an extent as to prevent serious resistance in western Europe.

Moreover, Russia has a police-state organization. She can do as she pleases, and when she pleases, with her people and her armament. She can attack without warning. She can thereby gain the great advantage of initiative and surprise and concentration of force that is denied the nations which refuse to commit acts of aggression.

Our potential allies in Europe are still far from recovering from the last war. Britain has only recently been able to relax her extremely strict economic controls. Her budgetary situation has been very weak. Vast strides have been made there and in western Europe since 1946, but those nations have been almost prostrated by the past war and have needed far more time than they have had to get back on their feet. We were well on our way to getting them there, but still had far to go.

By contrast, the Russian economy is state controlled. Dollars and money are responsive to the dictates of the rulers of the state. Budgetary considerations have little meaning, as compared with our own problems. In Russia it has been guns in place of the necessities of life during and since the war. Civilian discontent is ruthlessly suppressed. The discontented are brutally eliminated, and the secret police and propaganda controls place the entire nation in a strait-jacket so that the entire national effort can be channeled in this or that direction according to the desires of the rulers.

All of these things face us today in the world. It is one of the most dangerous—in my opinion, the most dangerous—situation ever to confront the American people. It is a situation that demands the utmost concentration of effort, the greatest forbearance, the greatest willingness to sacrifice we have ever had.

Above all, it requires that for the indefinite future our people and this Congress must keep as our first thought the maintenance of an adequate defense. If we fail to do so, our very national existence may be critically jeopardized.

And what are our strengths in this dangerous world today?

Governmentally we are far stronger than our potential enemies, for any system of government responsive to the will of the people has a broader, firmer

base than a government controlled by a dictator. In any long-term effort, I am certain that our system can outlast and surpass the dictated, regimented system of the Communists. Moreover, our competitive system has produced an industrial potential which is the envy of the world. Even though our standing military strength is very inadequate today, American potential is feared and respected the world over. Once our Nation turns to in an all-out military effort, near miracles of military production are achieved, and will again be achieved in case of another world-wide war. That lesson is not lost on the rulers of Russia, and we ourselves must not forget how tremendous that advantage is.

Our sea power is vastly greater than that of Russia and her satellites. Our strategic air power is unmatched anywhere in the world. We are still far ahead in the atomic-arms effort and will probably stay ahead for some years in the future.

Our transportation system, our industrial system, our communications system, the intelligence and educational level of our people, our magnificent scientific institutions and research laboratories, the level of development of our natural resources—all of these are a vast reservoir of strength unmatched on earth.

And let us not forget that these things are not unmeasured by Russia.

So to sum it up, this is our situation today.

We are seriously short at this critical moment in standing military strength. We have to build up, just as fast as we can, our ground troops in the Army, enlarge our Marine Corps, increase and improve our tactical air arm in the Air Force and enlarged the Marine Corps air arm, activate aircraft carriers, build many more tanks for the Army, activate destroyers and enlarge the antisubmarine patrol squadrons of the Navy, build more artillery for the Army and marines, expedite production of the newest anti-tank weapons, increase the number of transport vessels in the Navy—all of this over and above our efforts in Korea. And, of great importance, we must do all of this as rapidly as we can, because, as we have seen in Korea, weakness invites aggression, and there is little doubt that we have let ourselves get far too weak in the light of existing world conditions.

To do this, the President has asked the Congress to make available some \$10,000,000,000 more during this fiscal year. Part of these funds must defray the cost of the Korean effort; the remainder must go into the rebuilding and strengthening of our Armed Forces to meet the threats so evident in other parts of the world. In addition, the President said more funds must be provided for the military support of other nations in the world.

So that means well over \$10,000,000,000 to be added to the 1951 Federal budget of about \$43,000,000,000.

Now, that puts us in this kind of a situation.

We have to ruthlessly eliminate unnecessary projects from the Federal budget. We have to stand up to the

pressures that will come to continue projects in our congressional districts even though those projects have no direct relation to the defense effort. We have to do away with business-as-usual attitudes here in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in industry. We have to give military items first priority. We have to produce fewer television sets and automobiles and radios and such like and turn out more planes, guns, tanks, ships, and artillery, and it must be done in a great hurry. We must grimly respond to the dangerous times in which we are living, and do, without delay, what we know must be done in order to preserve the security of our Nation.

Later on, I am sure we will have to increase taxes. It is likely to be necessary to authorize the President to impose various controls over our economy to prevent runaway inflation, to prevent hoarding, to prevent deferment of essential military work, to prevent strikes in war industries, and so on.

But all of this readjustment in our national habits and outlooks has, I am convinced, the wholehearted support of the American people. There is not an American but who knows that the chips are down today in international life. Brute force respects only force, and it is up to us to obtain adequate force as quickly as we can.

In my judgment, if we build up the required force quickly, we can save peace in the world.

But if we falter, if we refuse to do the job quickly, if we cling to business-as-usual attitudes in the Congress and in industry, our weakness and indecision will surely invite further aggressions and ultimately foment the very world-wide crisis we are so anxious to avoid.

So I call upon the House to rise as one to insist upon a stern, a strong, a vigorous national program—to demand the elimination from the Federal budget of the frills and nonessentials—to replace optimism with realism—to reject peacetime, business-as-usual attitudes in the Government and in industry and get the necessary armed strength created just as quickly as possible.

As for the military side of the problem before us, my great concern is not that our military expansion is going to be too large, but I am apprehensive that it may be too small.

I feel, for example, that it is very unrealistic to limit the size of the American Army to below its authorized strength of 837,000 in view of the stupendous ground armies available to potential enemies in today's world.

I am unsatisfied with present plans for increasing the size of the Navy and Air Force, for I believe there is too much conservatism in the program. The Navy needs more aircraft carriers in commission—and needs them swiftly—and naval air requires prompt expansion.

The marines must be substantially enlarged, and their budgetary ceiling of 16 squadrons must be lifted.

The Congress should return at once to its goal of 70 air groups in the Air Force so that provision can be made for reasonable air support for the Army.

The Army tank program must be enlarged many times and greatly expedited, the

Our antisubmarine warfare program, in both ships and planes, must be greatly enlarged in view of the size of the submarine fleet available to Soviet Russia today.

I think many of us have been a bit too complacent. This is no time to run around trying to shift the blame for this or that deficiency to this or that person in the executive branch. Let us be realistic about it.

Our great need right now is to get the ox out of the ditch—not spend a lot of time and effort trying to find out who pushed him into the ditch. Let's not spend our time looking backwards while Americans are being killed in Korea and our defenses urgently need strengthening. It is time to get action. Let us get on the road and get up speed. This is no time to take a detour to hunt for scapegoats.

The simple truth of the matter is—and it is high time the Congress gave full consideration to it—yes; the grim and unpleasant truth is that a global war is a real, a distinct, possibility at any time. No one can tell what tomorrow may bring.

It is equally a real possibility, members of the committee, that we are to be treated to the new strategy of using the armies of satellite countries here and there in the world instead of the great military power of Soviet Russia herself.

Either of these contingencies requires a mighty, an immediate national effort to augment our national defense and to channel major parts of our industrial might into essentially military activities. The Korean war is going on right now. American boys are fighting it this very moment on the battlefield of a foreign country. Armament, equipment, men are needed urgently, and the strength directed there must be immediately replaced here. We must not have any side efforts as we try to meet this crisis. We have to build a mighty force at once.

And let me offer this thought to the Committee on Appropriations.

If we do too much in the way of arming, we will just lose dollars.

But if we do too little, we may lose American lives, we may lose vital engagements with an enemy, we may bring on global war through our indecision and weakness.

So, when the \$10,000,000,000 program is before the Appropriations Committee, I am hopeful that the committee will consider it a minimum, not a maximum. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will look into these concerns I have mentioned—concerns as to the proposed size of the Army, the number of aircraft carriers to be in commission, the number of aircraft for the Marine Corps and Air Force, the antisubmarine effort, the tank program of the Army, the organization and equipment of the tactical air arm of our Army, and so on.

And if the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, individually or collectively, indicate dissatisfaction with any element of the program but go along with it—as they have in the past—simply on the ground that considerations of economy must still prevail, then I hope and trust that the Committee on Appropriations will themselves exercise their proper

initiative and demand the fulfillment of a well-rounded, ample military program that will truly provide this mighty Nation the defense it must have.

It is high time that the American people be done with this emphasis on the so-called calculated risks we have heard so much about in the past 2 years.

Let us have much less risk, and much more calculation, in our defense program.

Let us have less talk about dollars, and more talk about strength, in our defense program. The defense of this country must not be measured in dollars. Its measurement must be what a potential enemy has, what he can do with it, what it looks like he wants to do with it, and when he wants to do it. I need not remind the Members of this body that Russia and her satellites have been working night and day for the past 5 years on their armaments—and I regret to say that, in some areas, we have not kept pace.

Now, I will tell the Committee briefly what is in this emergency measure.

This bill involuntarily extends enlistments in the Armed Forces. It potentially involves about 300,000 men, for that many enlistments will expire in the next 12 months. Forty-four thousand of them are General MacArthur's command—so that he might lose some 4,000 men a month during this critical period.

The figures break down this way.

In the next 12 months, in each service, these will be the following number of enlistment terminations: In the Army, 145,000; in the Navy, 62,000; in the Air Force, 88,000.

That makes a total of 295,000 enlistment terminations in the next 12 months.

The situation is, therefore, that these men must be held temporarily beyond the term of their enlistments until trained replacements can be provided. The committee approved a 1-year extension, as contrasted to a 21-month extension proposed by the executive branch. It was our view, and the military testimony supported the committee's position, that a 12-month extension would be sufficient, for in that period of time the trained replacements could be made available and these men released.

Now, by way of background, there is ample precedent for this type of legislation. The Congress did it before on August 18, 1941, except that at that time—4½ months before Pearl Harbor—the Congress extended the enlistments for 18 months instead of for 12 months, as proposed in this bill. The same thing was done in World War I. So the bill is not a precedent. Twice previously, in response to a critical world situation, the Congress has found it necessary to extend enlistments for a temporary period.

I think the Committee should also know that General MacArthur has urgently requested this legislation. He is very anxious for its immediate enactment so he can get on with the Korean effort without the heavy attrition and administrative burdens produced by enlistment terminations in his theater.

The other provisions of the bill are administrative in nature. I will mention one of them—section 3 of the bill. That

provision suspends old Navy law which gave pay and a quarter to persons whose enlistments expired while they were at sea or abroad. Its purpose was not to take care of any situation of the type now confronting the United States. Its purpose was to provide the additional pay on the ground that the men could not be discharged since they happened to be away from the country at the time of the enlistment expirations. They were kept at their stations until their return to the country and during that period received pay and a quarter. Other existing law will give the men kept in involuntarily under this bill the normal enlistment bonuses if they reenlist instead of submitting to involuntary retention.

Now, I wish to leave with the House this final thought.

We have heard about too little too late. We have heard that it is later than you think. We have heard time and again that weakness invites aggression. We have been told over and over again that Russia respects only force. So much have we heard these things in recent years that I am afraid we just accept them now without much thought and tend not to do much about them.

Well, let us get down to the job.

Let us think long and hard and grimly about this statement "too little too late" in today's world. Let us think about its meaning to our boys on Korea—maybe later in Germany—maybe later in Formosa—maybe later somewhere else on this troubled globe.

Let us ponder on the real meaning, in this atomic age, of the saying that "it is later than you think." In modern war there is no second prize for the runner-up. Let us not let time run through our fingers. Again, I say let us get down to the job and get this program into action and get it completed just as promptly as possible.

And, once again I say to the House, as I have said so many, many times in the past, "weakness invites aggression." Upon our speed of preparation, upon our determination in the Congress to give the Nation the strength it must have, depends the peace of the world.

Let us get America's muscles hardened to the point where the international bullies will respect what America stands for.

In that way, we can preserve peace.

In that way, we can preserve America.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am sure the House has heard with great interest his very interesting and instructive exposition of the difficult and dangerous situation that faces us. I am sure what he has said about our position strategically in the world and the strong position of Russia and the difficulties that we face, was heard with interest. I am sure we all agree that the time is certainly here to strengthen the military forces of the United States. But I think the Members of the House and the people of the United States will be interested in an answer that he might make

with respect to an omission in the gentleman's statement. Can the gentleman advise the House whether at this time the administration has as yet been able to evolve a consistent foreign policy and has it as yet been able to evolve a strategic plan?

Mr. VINSON. Let me answer the question.

Mr. COUDERT. This is just as important. The mere development of the great Armed Forces that we are going to develop and must develop is only half the game. The other half of the game is intelligent use of the military power available.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that the next time I have permission to address the House I will try to answer his question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Relative to the intent that is contained in the bill as it relates to men who are going to receive their discharge in the Regular Service within possibly the next months, and who wish to make a profession of a military career, what will be involved in their getting their emoluments under the discharge procedure that has heretofore prevailed if this bill is enacted?

Mr. VINSON. If anyone whose term of enlistment expires, and who is frozen in the service, reenlists, he gets the reenlistment bonus provided by law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement, as I always have been because he knows his subject. As far as preparation for any eventuality is concerned, I think the gentleman is most sincere. I am interested in knowing what our policy is, and what we are going to raise this big army for.

Mr. VINSON. I am trying to lay down here in the House of Representatives a policy of preparedness. I am trying to get the gentleman from Pennsylvania to stop measuring the defense of this country by dollars and, instead, measure the defense of this country by the potential strength of our enemy.

Mr. RICH. Are we expected to go at this alone? Are we going to get the aid and assistance of foreign countries under the United Nations?

Mr. VINSON. I hope the nations that are members of the United Nations will meet the call the United Nations has put upon them as speedily as possible.

Mr. RICH. Suppose they do not?

Mr. VINSON. If they do not, then we have to assume the responsibility as one member.

Mr. RICH. Are we going to go it alone?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Over and above all, we have the duty and responsibility of looking out primarily for our own national interest.

Mr. VINSON. Of course; that is right.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to ask a couple of questions of the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. My first question is with reference to what, as I get it, has particularly disturbed the minds of the people of this country and my own as well. They are asking what is the trouble in Korea that we are being beaten as we are and being continually driven back. Is it a question of lack of tanks and heavy artillery, or what?

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the gentleman that the main trouble is 5,000 miles of distance from our base of supply. Of course, when the Korean trouble broke out there was no equipment in Korea of the kind necessary to fight a modern war. The Government is doing everything humanly possible, as rapidly as distances will permit, to put forces there to meet the forces of the Reds.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. One other question: Is it not true that at the start of the war over there our forces had to depend only on what could be flown in; consequently none of the heavy tanks or heavy artillery was in Korea or probably is in Korea today? Is not that true?

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman is as well aware of all that information as I am. I think the gentleman gets his information from the same source I get a great deal of it, from the newspapers.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am sure the gentleman flatters me out of all measure if he thinks I can get as much information as he can.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say this: We are doing everything humanly possible to get equipment and men into Korea, but you have to bear in mind one thing: This Nation must not be sucked in at this and that point of the globe. We have to be cautious in what we do.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. One further question, if I may: Who made the decision that Korea was defensible at the time of the outbreak of this war?

Mr. VINSON. I regret that I cannot advise the gentleman as to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Georgia, whom we all love and for whom we have great respect, has left on my mind the impression that he thinks this Congress has been stingy with dollars.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia if during the past 5 years he has brought to this House a single bill for the defense of the United States that this Congress and this House have not supported?

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan I appeared, speaking for the Committee on Armed Services, before the Committee on Appropriations on March 30, 1949. I was the spokesman for the Committee on Armed Services and accompanying me were the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and others. I asked that the budget at that time be increased. We appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and asked for \$2,674,000,000 more than was in the budget.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That does not answer my question.

Mr. VINSON. Of course it answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That does not answer my question.

Mr. VINSON. The Armed Services Committee has no authority over the money. We have authority only over the legislative authorizations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. That is all we have.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And this House has passed your bill. I do not recall in 16 years the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] bringing a bill to the House for the defense of this country that the House has failed to sustain.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I do not recall it in the past 10 years that I have been here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not recall it for at least 16 years.

Mr. VINSON. May I say I am very grateful for the confidence that the House has shown in the Committee on Armed Services during that period of time and to the former Committee on Naval Affairs. The point is that there are certain things that the Committee on Armed Services has been fighting for. Only 90 days ago we pointed out certain things. But we could not get the money. We did not get the money.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak a word on this particular measure because I am wholeheartedly in favor of it, as I am the next bill we will consider to lift the ceilings on the personnel of our armed services, and I think practically every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle is. It is a very simple measure, similar to the one we passed, both at the outbreak of World War I and at the outbreak of World War II.

Realizing that there will be approximately 300,000 members of our armed services—the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force—whose enlistments will expire during the next calendar year, our committee, and I am sure the Congress, are thoroughly convinced, that it is imperative and inescapable that we extend the enlistments for the next 12 months. In ordinary peacetimes over 50 percent of those whose enlistments expire would reenlist. They are trained personnel. They are experienced personnel. It is not easy, indeed it is next to impossible to supplant them overnight with raw, green recruits. Many of them are now fighting in distant parts of the world, or are stationed for security reasons at different posts all over the globe, and it is exceedingly difficult for us to bring back these men, as their enlistments expire from day to day and week to week and month to month when a war is raging.

So the whole purpose of the bill S. 3937, a bill to authorize the President to extend the enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States, is to hold the men who are now in the various branches of the armed services long enough until replacements can be obtained by enlistment, by call of Reserves and the National Guard, or by the draft, and properly trained to take their place.

Now that is all the bill provides for. It is bad policy for the Government to break a contract with any of its citizens. It is tough for a 30-year-old man, fighting in the rice paddies of Korea, his wife and a couple of kids in Japan or back home in the States, to be held on at the expiration of his 3- or 4-year service, particularly when there are some unmarried individuals between the ages of 26 and 30 back home who perhaps are not contributing their full share in this crisis, to the defense of the Nation.

But, ladies and gentlemen, liberty is the first casualty of war. Truth is usually next. When you engage in an armed conflict, freedom is gone. All of us are going to be required to do things we do not want to do. We are going to have our activities curbed. There will be allocations, priorities, rationing, and certain controls, no doubt, if the flames touched off in Korea engulf the world. Painful as that is, it is inescapable. You cannot fight a painless war. It is just impossible.

I want to say one or two things in a general way, aside from this bill, particularly since our distinguished and able chairman took considerable time to talk about the over-all picture.

In order to win a modern, mechanized war, the victor must possess at least three materials. He has to have iron and steel, rubber, and oil. Soviet Russia has secured a lot of iron and steel and industry in Manchuria, a territory twice as large as the State of Texas, which is the industrial heart of all Asia. And she would not have that steel if the Chinese, after being promised at the Cairo Conference that Manchuria would be returned to them at the end of the war, had not been sold down the river, and Manchuria turned over to Soviet Russia.

Who is responsible for that action? Russia has got to have not only iron and steel in Manchuria and the rich metals and minerals of China that has gone completely under. Everyone knows China is the head, the heart, the bowels, and legs of Asia; and because of the recent weak, indecisive, vacillating, contradictory foreign policy, all China has been lost to Red communism. Who is responsible for that? What Members of the House and Senate have stood and pled week after week, month after month, for a strong far eastern foreign policy? The Republicans, as the record will show. Now that China has gone under, after being told that we should keep hands off until the dust settled; after being told by the Secretary of Defense that it was not our responsibility to defend Korea, or any other spot in the Orient; and after being told by the Secretary of State we will have nothing to do with the defense of Formosa; after the Secretary of Defense told us repeatedly, before our committee and in public

addresses during the past 6 months, that if we were attacked at any place at 4 o'clock in the morning we would be ready to answer at 5 o'clock; after being repeatedly told by members of the administration that South Korea was capable of defending herself; after all of these miscalculations and misrepresentations, not only to the American people but to your Committee on Armed Services, we have now completely reversed our foreign policy in Asia, and we have decided to go into the one spot with its tough terrain, with its foul weather, the most difficult place on earth to pit our strength against the force of the ground armies of Soviet Russia, namely, Korea. Russia's strength always has been in her ground forces.

Recently the President of the United States has repeatedly told the American people, at the commencement exercises at the University of Missouri in Columbia last month and at the dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in St. Louis the following day, that we are closer to peace than any time since the shooting stopped in 1945.

At Korea, a little sort of finger, an appendix of the Asiatic continent about the size of Illinois, 600 miles long, 135 miles wide, we go in to defend only the south half of it, and defend it with what? Who withdrew Lieutenant General Hodge and his 40,000 American troops from Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel a year ago last month, in June 1949?

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and others here with me in 1946 were in Korea. We went up and down that arbitrary thirty-eighth parallel that has no military significance; there is not a mountain range, there is no river, there is nothing geographical about it; it is just a line that was blindly, arbitrarily, and stubbornly drawn so that the Japs north of the thirty-eighth parallel would surrender to the Russians, and the Japs south of the thirty-eighth parallel would surrender to the Americans. General Hodge, with his 40,000 troops, repatriated over 5,000,000 Japanese soldiers, not only from Korea but from Manchuria and China.

When we returned from our trip in October 1946 we unanimously agreed that the moment we pulled out of Korea the Russians or the Communists would move in. That is what we told the Congress; that is what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] and I told the American people in a broadcast over a Washington radio, with Ernest K. Lindley acting as moderator.

Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, we are in for it; for the third time in our generation we are engaged in a bloody and devastating war. Of course, in 1916 an administration was elected to power because it kept us out of war; in 1940 another administration for the third time was returned to power because it promised again, and again, and again, that American boys would not have to fight and die on foreign soil; and now, today for the third time we are engaged in war, and Congress has not declared it.

We were not requested or asked for counsel or advice; but we were told on a

half sheet of paper when we were called down to the White House 4 weeks ago on Tuesday, I think it was 4 weeks ago today, that the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief, had ordered naval and air support for the ground forces in Korea after we had withdrawn our own forces over a year ago. We cannot now debate the legality or constitutionality of the action of the President. "The die is cast." The poor southern Koreans, most of them farmers—it is an agricultural section—with bamboo poles and spears trying to stop 60-ton Russian tanks.

Oh, yes; I feel that there will be no peace in our time; there will be intermittent wars the rest of our days. The moment we squelch the war in Korea it will break out in Formosa, it will pop up in Iran; it is just like the measles, you do not know whether they are going to break out around your ankles or your neck.

You can rest pretty well assured that we will not be able to confine this conflict to Korea. We cannot contain it in that narrow theater. Much as I hope and pray we can hold the area, there is a very small foothold left for us to stand on and perhaps within the next few days we will be driven into the sea. Of course only time will tell. I am no military strategist or tactician, but our best experts themselves do not know.

I want to be realistic. I am tired of being kidded. I am tired of men in high places in our Government, from the Commander in Chief and the Secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff, all the way down the line, assuring us we will be ready. Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, I will say to my beloved friend from Georgia, I fear there is too little, too late. But who is responsible for that?

We have appropriated \$50,000,000,000 for national defense in the past 4 years—fifty thousand million dollars. Where has the money gone? What have we got to show for it? Why were the weapons placed in moth balls and cocoons and put away? Oh, those tanks, those B-29's, my beloved chairman, in moth balls are not helping the poor, young inexperienced doughboys in Korea who are up against some of the toughest men, battle-scarred, most experienced troops in all the world, because these same North Koreans fought to help defend Stalin-grad, they fought the Japanese not only in Korea but in Manchuria, they fought in the Chinese civil war.

It is not going to be very pleasant for a lot of American fathers and mothers to know that we have given to the different nations under the ECA and other programs in Europe and in the Near East over \$35,000,000,000; yet today our kids are fighting with inadequate weapons, with an insufficient supply of matériel, with ineffective guns in their hands. Had we not given away so much of our civilian military production to other nations, perhaps our own troops in Korea would not now be so short of supplies and ammunition.

Mr. Chairman, the ridiculous and silly charge has been made by the left-wing new Dealers in the Democratic Party that the Republicans are to blame for the Korean crisis because we did not vote

for economic aid for Korea. Nothing could be more stupid or unfair, because a school child knows that it would be supreme folly to vote economic aid for Korea without backing it up by military assistance. Had we sent fertilizer, farm machinery, hydroelectric equipment, and other industrial machines to develop South Korea, we would simply have built up a greater and richer prize for Russia to take over. The only reason that the Communists have not moved into southern Korea, which we abandoned more than a year ago, was in the hope that we would send much of our wealth and materials over there for her to seize.

Too little, too late? Oh, yes, CARL, but I want to ask my friend from Georgia, and he is a peach because all of the peaches do not grow on trees in Georgia, who is responsible for this too little, too late? Who is responsible for the miscalculations, for the gross misrepresentations? Certainly no one can blame the Congress of the United States, and most of all our Committee on the Armed Services. Heaven knows, we have bent over backward to go along with the military. We have tried to comply with practically every request they made. No minority party ever tried or voted with the majority as have we. Certainly the Republicans cannot be blamed for our present debacle. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], sitting in front of me, knows we have gone further than that. We have tried year after year to get them to build up the Air Force to 70 groups. We had to cram that down their throats. We were told, "Oh, we cannot afford it, we do not need it." Who did that?

This administration canceled the big, modern aircraft carrier for the construction of which this Congress twice specifically appropriated funds. It was arrogantly, it was defiantly canceled. Why? By whom?

I have received letters from two or three of my Navy friends during the past week in which they stated: "What a shame it is we do not have two or three more carriers out here in this operational area between Korea and Formosa."

God knows, if anything has proven the worth of the House Armed Services Committee's B-36 hearings of last fall, the events of the past month have certainly done so. We know that there will always and must be a Navy and a Marine Corps; we have got to have them just as we have got to have an Air Force for strategic bombing and just as we have to have Army ground forces to go in and take over, then hold what we take. All are indispensable.

Now I want to drive home this point. Do you know that under this proposed expansion program, bringing the forces up to the previously planned 1952 level in the year 1951, it will still be less than what we had in 1949? We have had only one battleship, of course, the *Missouri*, in commission those 3 years, but we have fewer cruisers not only today, but we will have fewer cruisers next year than we had in 1949, we will have fewer heavy aircraft carriers, we will have fewer destroyers, fewer submarines, fewer escort vessels, and all other types of ships. Who is responsible? What

party has been in power all these years? What party holds the purse strings of these United States? No; we do not want to try to assess the blame or put the responsibility upon any particular person or group of persons, because that is water under the bridge and over the dam. But we cannot afford, as a nation, to blind our eyes to grievous mistakes that have been made in the past. We must look back to our mistakes, admit them in order to avoid them in the future. I think if we had a general, a thorough housecleaning, in both our State and our Defense Departments, we could become much stronger. Now that is not a pleasant thing to say; do not think I enjoy saying it. If I did not say a word about it perhaps I would be more popular. I am not seeking popularity but I am concerned about my country. But there is so much more I might say and that I will say, too, in the days that are ahead. Of course, we want to tighten our belts, pull ourselves together, stop our petty bickering, and join hands and heads and hearts for the welfare of the Nation.

Oh, just listen to the jeers from the majority side. You are seeing displayed here today the very spirit that we are fighting to destroy abroad. Even in time of war you cannot throttle freedom of speech; and certainly, in time of war, realizing that the blood of men and women of all faiths, parties, and creeds are mingled and shed in the defense of this Nation, it ill behooves some of you little peewees of narrow minds and shriveled souls to display the arrogant attitude of intolerance, unwilling to listen to anybody who might possibly differ in the least with you. Well, you are going to have to listen whether you like it or not. And when you are here for a while, you certainly will know better.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I think, in passing, that the gentleman should not miss this opportunity to call the attention of the House to this very fact, that had it not been for the B-36 investigation this last year by the Committee on Armed Services, let me ask the membership of this House, where would our Marine Corps and where would our Navy be? How much would be left? Ask yourselves that question.

Mr. SHORT. There is just one other thought I want to leave before I stop, and that is to follow the sound advice that will be given to you soon by the distinguished and able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. He has been studying the Stock Piling Act for many years. I participated in many of those sessions. He knows more about that problem than any other Member of Congress. Let me tell you, if you knew the facts as they actually exist on our stockpiling program, you would shudder in your boots today. We need manganese more than any other material. It is the one indispensable item. You cannot manufacture steel without it, and unless we somehow or other build up our manganese stockpile I fear what the outcome of this global conflict might be.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in this address I said that to win a modern, mechanized war, the victor must possess at least three materials: iron or steel, rubber, and oil. I tried to point out that Russia has the iron and steel in Manchuria. She does not yet have a sufficient quantity of rubber and oil to conduct a global war.

However, most of the world knows, certainly we do, that Russia has her eyes cast on Indonesia and Malaya, Sumatra, Java, and Singapore to get the rubber after the fall of Indochina. She also has her eyes cast upon Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, in fact the whole Near East with its rich oil deposits in order that she might complete her program to have steel, rubber, and oil to fight a global conflict.

Sir, we cannot permit the Russian bear to reach out her paws and gather in all the little, weak countries on her perimeter to secure the materials with which to conquer the world.

Mr. Chairman, there is another quality which is necessary for any country to win in any armed conflict. That is a spiritual quality and a moral force which dictators often overlook or underestimate.

The love of liberty, the devotion to a great and righteous cause, the indomitable spirit of men which believes in the dignity of the human soul and the love of a just and lasting peace. These ethical principles cannot be conquered by the might of materialism. In the beginning of a conflict, brute force may triumph for a while, but the undying faith, the resolute will, the indomitable courage born of Christian idealism will ultimately triumph. These virtues which belong to the United States and western civilization will eventually triumph over the ruthless instincts and barbarous tactics of a Godless atheistic communism. We will give Russia and the whole world to understand that much as we might differ among ourselves in a country of free men on domestic issues, we shall ever rise as a united Nation and a united people to fight and die to preserve our Republic against all ruthless aggressors.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, to clear up what was perhaps a misinterpretation of my earlier remarks, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in the hope that no misunderstanding can develop from any remark that I make. I do not intend to convey the thought that the Committee on Appropriations has failed to give every dollar the budget has recommended. The Appropriations Committee has done that. The Appropriations Committee and certain members of it, particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the distinguished former chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Naval Affairs [Mr. PLUMLEY], all participated in the fight on the floor of the House 2 years ago for more money for naval aviation, which the House, after debate, rejected by a vote of approximately 65 for to 125 against.

The House of Representatives is not subject to any criticism, for we have not failed to provide far more, repeatedly,

than the budget has recommended. As a result of going on behalf of the Armed Services Committee to the Appropriations Committee in 1949, the budget was increased \$800,000,000 specifically for the Air Force.

I do not want anybody to think I am criticizing the Appropriations Committee, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and his committee, particularly Mr. SIKES, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. SHEPPARD in the forefront, were trying to write into the appropriation bill the items the Joint Chiefs of Staff had in their minds, which were oftentimes curtailed by the budget.

Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side. If there are no requests for time on the other side, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in a syndicated article published July 21, 1950, in the Grand Rapids Press, and other newspapers throughout the United States, the prominent columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, had the following to say:

Out in Korea the American boys are fighting bravely and many are dying, but inside Washington there is a bitter feeling of criticism concerning certain decisions of the top command—General Collins of the Army and General Vandenberg of the Air Force—who are charged with having combined to squelch the opportunity of the United States Marine aviation units to fight in the Far East.

From other sources similar information has also been received. In addition, an interesting letter was recently forwarded to me by a constituent and for the information of the Members of the House the pertinent portions are as follows:

I am a naval reservist and expect to be called back to active duty at any time. My first gripe is aimed at the high brass at that huge office building, the Pentagon. We've enjoyed the benefits of unification since 1948, and I think it stinks. What kind of unification is it that calls the Marine Reserve ground forces to active duty and leaves Marine Reserve air units at home? What's the matter with Naval Air Reserve units? This war is supposed to be an air war, let's use all our air forces. * * * If it isn't going to be an air war, this country has been sold a bill of goods. Our Marine Corps, the best fighting group we have had in any war, has been rendered virtually useless as a result of unification. A marine by virtue of his training is imbued with that elusive esprit de corps, morale, or plain guts to fight and win. In World War II no other branch of the service could show the same qualities to any marked degree. I'm sure any military critic will say our last war in the Pacific was a Marine victory—with a slight assist by the Army and Navy. Let's give the marines in this fight the support of their own air units. Also, let's get the Marine Corps back up to somewhere near their wartime strength and keep it up there through the years ahead. It would be as good insurance as a 70-group air force. I'm like all sailors: I have a dislike for marines along with a hearty respect for their ability.

In the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., a Marine Reserve unit has been faithfully training for the past few years. It is D Company of the Eighth Infantry, Battalion. This unit either has or is sched-

uled for a call to active duty. In my estimation it would be tragic for this unit of the Marines or any other fighting Marine outfit to be sent into the front in Korea or elsewhere without the benefit of trained Marine air group tactical support. I strongly urge that any plan be abandoned for the splitting up of Marine ground units from Marine air groups.

This rumored plan to break up the long-established and highly effective Marine air-ground coordination has been in the minds of some of our Army and Air Force leaders for a number of years, but despite this pressure the integrity of the entire Marine program has been maintained except for slashes in numbers all along the line. However, the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, seems to have been victimized by this unsound thinking, for he is quoted as having said:

We cannot afford to have three separate air forces—Navy, Marine, and Air Force.

It is obvious that the rumors mentioned in Mr. Lawrence's column are in line with Mr. Johnson's basic thinking.

It is important to understand a few basic and fundamental facts in discussing this problem. In the first place, marine aviation is not separate; it is a legal and administrative fact that marine aviation is administratively and technically a part of naval aviation under the applicable statutes. Marine aviation organizations are like the rest of the marines—part of the Naval Establishment. All procurement of the matériel and training of any pilots for marine aviation is included in the naval air program.

During World War II Admiral King, in an effort to determine any possible savings in the Naval Establishment, convened a board within the Navy Department to determine what would be the effect from the economy standpoint of abolishing marine aviation in toto. After exhaustive inquiries this board concluded and actually placed upon record certain important conclusions. It was the board's decision that, because of the very close integration of marine air training and operations into the naval air program, there would be, in fact, no savings resulting from the elimination of the marine air program. The assignment of strictly naval air units for the performance of functions previously handled by marine air groups was not recommended. It was found there would be no economies and the effectiveness of this vital military weapon would be abolished by such a plan.

Anyone who is at all familiar with marine air group operations knows that marine air units are trained to operate off either Navy carriers or advanced land bases. Marine air units exist for one primary reason, and one reason alone: The support, very close support, of the ground troops. In this connection it should be recalled that it was marine preoccupation with the amphibious specialty that resulted in the marine employment of our present-day close air support doctrine which, as it is used in the Marine Corps, is the most effective

close air-support program possessed by any armed forces in the world. Marine close air support not only includes isolation of the battle field, but such support is predicated upon the actual assistance of ground units by attacking specific targets opposing marine ground effort. As a result, the marine system of close air support is designed to bring down on an enemy an air strike whenever required by the front-line ground commander. This is in contrast to the theory of saturation of area targets and the control of supporting aircraft by the top echelon of ground commanders away from the fighting front.

Unlike other United States air-support doctrine, marines have carried air-ground integration to such a point that in every front-line battalion and in other specially designated units there is a marine air-control officer. This officer is trained in both air and ground techniques. He is a marine aviator, but basically, as are all marines, a marine first, last, and always. Marine air, rather than being separated from the ground effort, as has been the case of the technical support of Army units resulting from the creation of a separate air force is based upon the air-ground team concept.

Some people may well ask this question: How does this powerful close air support conception fit into the otherwise completely unique Marine Corps idea? The answer is simple and understandable. The Marine Corps usefulness as a military outfit lies largely in its adherence to the team idea. The Marine Corps feels it is their mandate to be ready with a team—not a very big one perhaps—but still a complete team to answer the call at any time.

Since in operations across the water such as we are now fighting in Korea, the Marine Corps cannot always have the tanks and artillery they need right at the moment of landing, the Marine Corps must rely more extensively on this extremely flexible weapon, namely, close support planes. Without them the marines are only a partial team and cannot be expected to be completely effective in all the complex operations assigned them. However, with their own close support planes the marines have the necessary balance and the striking power and the readiness to move into action which gives modern significance to the old marine saying "first to fight."

To give this teamwork real effect, the Marine Corps puts specially trained air personnel directly with the front line troops to observe closely the progress of the battle and to call for and direct these vital close support air attacks. The Marine Corps is the only military organization in the world that does this with such thoroughgoing detail, and needless to say it has paid tremendous dividends in the past. Consequently, it would be most unwise to change this method at this crucial hour when the marines are again going to be called upon to do their job in a new Pacific war.

Marines had to develop a close air support doctrine simply because the nature of amphibious operations was such that there had to be an effective type of

immediate, front-line controlled, air support in order to cover the ground attacks in an amphibious operation prior to the landing of heavier items of artillery and other supporting weapons. It should not be forgotten that marines pioneered dive bombing and logistical support of ground troops by air. In passing, it might be worth noting that in 1933, when Major Udet of the German Luftwaffe was watching a marine aviation squadron put on a demonstration at the Cleveland air races that he was so impressed by marine dive bombing that he stated he was going to recommend the German Air Force adopt a similar technique.

The record of marine aviation in World War II was outstanding in the annals of close air-support history. Carrier- or land-based marine close air-support aviation was able to deliver battalion-controlled air strikes with but a few minutes notice and it was very normal to deliver strafing, bombing, and rocket attacks against enemy positions as close as 100 yards to our own front lines. It is reported that on at least one occasion on Iwo Jima a close air support attack was launched within 50 yards of our own troops.

Another point that should be considered is the fact that there is no real duplication or competition between the Air Force generally and marine and naval close air-support programs. For example, the Air Force is today preoccupied with long-range strategic bombing and jet interceptor planes. It is no secret that everything else is secondary as far as operations within the Air Force are concerned. Accordingly, and quite properly, the Air Force has today developed, due to its preoccupation and emphasis on long-range bombing, the finest long-range bomber in the world, namely, the B-36. On the other hand, it must be remembered that while making this great advance in strategic air, no basic improvement has been made by the Air Force in close air support doctrine or matériel. This is best evidenced by the immediate calling up of P-51 conventional type aircraft for the Air Force's operations in Korea.

Fortunately the marine and naval aviation experts have not been preoccupied with long-range strategic bombing, but in contrast have emphasized and focused their attention on naval air operations involving close air support of ground troops in amphibious and related operations. As a result of this activity which is so important to expeditionary troops of the fleet marine forces there has been continued perfection of our close air-support doctrines and techniques. For example, we are now reported to have the finest kind of support aircraft in the new Martin Mauler. The point should carefully be noted that this aircraft was conceived and produced not by the Air Force, to which close air support is of secondary importance, but rather by naval aviation and marines whose specialty is close air-support activity. The different interests of the Air Force and marine-naval aviation has given our Nation comple-

mentary—not conflicting—types of air power. To now withhold marine aviation units from active participation with marine ground units in Korea would be disastrous, to say the least.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize again the absolute need and necessity for maintaining the close cooperation and integrity of marine ground and marine air units. I trust that the decisions in the Korean operation are unfounded, for history shows that in Pacific warfare a full marine team—ground and air—is essential in the jobs assigned to the Corps.

Mr. SHORT. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That until July 9, 1951, the President shall be authorized to extend all enlistments in any component of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, and the United States Marine Corps, including the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, and in any component of the Air Force of the United States for a period of not to exceed 12 months: Provided, That all persons whose terms of enlistments are extended in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall continue during such extensions to be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations for the government of their respective service.

SEC. 2. Personnel of the uniformed services entitled to benefits under section 515 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 831) shall not suffer any reduction in total compensation by reason of any extended service performed under the terms of this act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of raising two or three questions. They may not be answered; it may be impossible to answer them. In doing this, I realize that war is the most expensive game that man ever played or ever will play, not only in materials but in so-called finance as well as in human blood and suffering. Wars have to be financed either by compulsion or by voluntary service and voluntary contributions in the way of purchase of Treasury issues and in the payment of taxes which after all is somewhat voluntary because in this country you do not have to work and earn income which can be taxed—you can just lie down and quit and the welfare agencies will feed your wife and children. So paying taxes is more or less a voluntary proposition.

The great chairman of the committee that has brought this bill to the floor has discussed the question of dollars—and I am not up here to put dollars against human bodies now or at any other time, but the people in my district are very much concerned about the mental attitude of those in the defense arms of Government who disburse the dollars which are provided by the taxpayers and the bond buyers and therefore they have not had answered to them in a satisfactory manner, to say the least, what the administrators of the defense program have done with between sixty and ninety billion dollars which has been provided for defense during the past few years.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman to give us any comfort on that that he may.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the distinguished gentleman that I do not know that I can answer his question, but I am trying to find information to answer it.

But I can say this: Out of every dollar appropriated for national defense, 60 cents goes to what is called housekeeping in the Defense Department. Now, the gentleman is absolutely correct and the country does want to know what is the character of our defense; what kind of tank program we have; how much artillery we have; how many men we have; how many airplanes we have. The Committee on Armed Services started yesterday on a hearing to find out what the situation is. Just as soon as we get the information, I propose to bring it to the floor of the House and tell the country how much defense we have.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman for that information. I did not have it before and I do not know how many other Members of the House had it, either. The people did not have it and that is exactly what I think should be done—we should proceed just along that line.

Just one other thought. So many billions of dollars have been thrown at the feet of the administrators of national defense during the past 15 years that it is only human that those administrators have become ruthless in the expenditure of those funds. The situation now is that we are starting out with a \$260,000,000,000 debt. We started out on the last war with about a \$49,000,000,000 debt and by the time we wind up after a 2-, 3-, 4-, 5- or 10-year war, we may have six or eight trillion dollars in the national debt, unless we do get better sense in the operation of the administration of these funds.

I hope that the Committee on Armed Services will do the necessary things to put the throttle on those who are to administer these funds so that they will have a little respect for the use of material and the burdens that are placed on the citizens insofar as dollars are concerned. Dollars just represent material. And if we win any wars or keep a little peace in the world we will still need a few pieces of material for those who are at peace to use after the wars have finished.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any idea how much we have in stockpiles? I understand that Members are having great difficulty in finding how much we have in our stockpiles.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been reading stockpile hearings all day. I started early this morning. I have a bunch of them here. I think our stockpile situation will prove to be even more distressing and more disappointing than the situation with reference to equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Here is one illustration: You cannot run an army or a navy without good rope. In the Philippine Islands we have several thousand bales of manila hemp. That should have been put into the United States 6 to 9 months ago. Have the forces down here in charge of the administration moved those bales of fiber? Have they tried to move them? No. Let this committee get the answer why that stuff was not moved over here for defense. Take any stockpile you want, and it is 75 to 90 percent deficient. We will have some more talk about that tomorrow afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of course, when all such measures come to the floor there are some Members who cannot resist the opportunity to inject politics. Even on legislation so vital to our national security and the preservation of our American way of life.

The question has been asked today, "Where did all this defense money go?" Where did the \$45,000,000,000 go that we appropriated for defense since the close of World War II? I think if any Member is sincere in wanting to find that answer he would have little difficulty and little trouble in finding it. First of all, he could call the defense establishment and they would tell him promptly and accurately. If he did not care to call the defense establishment, all he would have to do is to keep himself well informed by reading the daily newspapers.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wonder if you have observed as a member of the Armed Services Committee that a lot of people at this time have 20-20 vision in their hindsight.

Mr. PRICE. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I am sorry, I have only 5 minutes.

I have followed the daily newspapers very closely and I know you do not even have to go to the defense establishment to get the answer to this very important question. I inserted in yesterday's RECORD an editorial from the Evening Star of last Saturday which cleared up this subject pretty well. I am going to read to the House some of the figures quoted in that editorial. Those who are interested can read the complete editorial in the Appendix on page A5328 of the RECORD. This newspaper was interested enough to check the figures and they got their information from the defense establishment without difficulty.

Out of every dollar expended for national defense over the past years, since

the war, 40 cents of it goes for salaries; food, clothing, and transportation. Twenty-six cents goes for operation and maintenance of equipment. Eighteen cents for weapons, planes, ships, and so forth. Five cents goes for research and development. Four and one-half cents goes for administration and secret work. Four cents goes for the reserves and the National Guard. One cent goes for industrial mobilization. Less than one cent goes to retired pay, and one-half of 1 cent goes for construction and public works.

Now, what situation have we had confronting us during the past 5 years? Where is this \$45,000,000,000? I am going to read the last two paragraphs from this editorial:

Defense officials say the best measure of military spending, as it relates to what we have to show for our money today, is the authorized outlays for the 4-year period from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1950. During this time Congress authorized \$49,300,000,000 for the military, of which \$48,400,000,000 has been spent to date and nearly a billion more will have been spent by the end of this fiscal year. Almost \$20,000,000,000 went for payrolls, food, clothing, and travel; \$13,000,000,000 for operating and maintaining military installations and tactical equipment around the globe; and \$8,500,000,000 for procurement of planes, tanks, rifles, artillery, ships, and other combat tools.

During this cold-war era, it should be remembered, occurred the costly airlift operations and the support of our occupation troops in Europe and Japan—expenses not ordinarily budgeted in time of so-called peace. In summation, our defense dollar has had a huge chunk eaten out of it by ordinary and extraordinary expenses that produced no tangible equipment for our foot soldiers, flyers, sailors, and marines. In fact, 70 cents of the dollar went for housekeeping and operational costs. If there is any possible way to reduce the drain on the defense dollar, the Defense Department has been unable to find it. For our fighting men must not only be supplied with arms but must be paid, fed, clothed, housed, and transported. It is for such essential things that our money—nearly \$100,000,000,000 of it—has gone during the past half decade of an uneasy peace.

That information was not very difficult to obtain. Anyone who wanted to, could have easily obtained it. It was as close at hand as the telephone on your desk, the paper on your newsstand.

Let us suspend politics while we consider important defense legislation. This is not the time for politics as usual.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are several things on which there is no uncertainty: One is that the Americans in all the forces, Air, Ground, and Navy, are valiantly fighting to the highest degree that can be expected of any soldier. We know that the Armed Services Committee in an effort to make this country strong had passed various enabling bills, and we know that the appropriations have been made by this Congress to make a strong, balanced armed service.

I shall not, and will not, attempt to place blame anywhere; this is not the time; it is a time for America to look forward rather than back and exert every possible effort to bring forth a strong, well-rounded armed service. But in doing that, let us, not in the spirit

of placing blame, but in the hope of becoming strong, analyze our difficulties. Let us analyze the past, yes, so that corrections may be made if corrections are needed and unhesitatingly make them if necessary. This Congress has a grave responsibility. Unfortunately Congress voted away and delegated much of its authority in the second Unification Act, an act directed to the concentration of power in the Department of Defense. I am glad that I was in the little group of about a dozen who voted against it. That is water over the dam. The power is gone to a great extent, but let us conserve and exercise that power which is left. There is a definite obligation on this Congress to see that the spirit of the Unification Act is carried out, and the autonomy of these various services is preserved, and to check a tendency first apparent, then admitted, of having but one ground army, practically no Marine Corps, a weakened Navy, the naval air arm and the carriers withered in strength. Many of us have protested consistently and vigorously that course, yet it has been progressively carried on. Not in the Congress but in the Department of Defense. Now it is the obligation of the Congress to see that that pattern is completely abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, I made a speech on the floor of the House on August 2, 1949, in which I quoted Admiral Halsey. I want to again quote from Admiral Halsey. It indicates some of the apprehension that existed in my mind at that time. He made the following statement:

The concept of what each weapon can or cannot do theoretically is very ridiculous. The only thing I can think of that is more ridiculous is the fact that you have a weapon and, through legislative or other act, you cannot use that weapon because it might interfere with the glory of some other person who has a similar weapon. I think the object in war is to strike with as many weapons as possible as often and as fast as possible. I think that is the surest and best way to terminate a war. I would go further than that, and say I do not think any weapon should be in any way restricted, whether it belongs to the Army, Navy, or the Air Force, or is used only for a special purpose. In other words, they should be used where they are most needed.

My thoughts boiled down are these: We know—as has been discussed informally in cloakrooms and in committees—that there has been a tendency to build up the vertical chain of command to the detriment of the offensive essential potential of the Navy, the Marine Corps, their air arm, the National Guard, and Reserves. The hour has arrived when the Congress must demand balanced services. Of course, the Congress voted away a good deal of power, but the Congress can demand that through administrative action in the Defense Department the intent of the Congress is not thwarted.

There has been much talk about appropriations. We have appropriated large sums of money. Then after the appropriations have been made, possibly for a given service—yes, for carriers and aircraft, or for any other thing that this Congress might have appropriated—we see by administrative action the intent of the Congress diverted or

nullified. If America is to stay strong, and America in this hour must be strong, we have to have balanced services, we have to have three strong services, and the only way you are going to have them is for this Congress to demand that the money be spent in the manner we have appropriated it and not in furtherance of any structural plan directed to the weakening and elimination of any of the services.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the junior members of the Armed Services Committee. I was gratified at the speech made by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. It gave us all confidence and hope. The first week after the Korean war started, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] was required to be away from Washington. It was with a sense of relief personally to me that I learned he had returned to Washington. I admire the straightforward manner in which he spoke here today to the Congress of the United States and I think the people of America tonight will sleep in their beds with a little more feeling of relief. I know I shall.

Mr. Chairman, there appear to be a lot of prophets today upon this floor. Where have those prophets been during the last 2 years? Why have they not raised their voices? Why have they not given the President the advantage of their great hindsight? I spoke here a few days ago and I said at that time I thought it was about time we laid aside partisanship.

Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in what happened in Korea. I am not interested in the fact that Secretary Johnson may have been wrong when he did away with the building of the carrier *United States*. I am not interested in the mistakes that have been made in our committee. I am one of the members of the Committee on the Armed Services who believes in a strong Air Force. I may personally have been wrong in my views about the Navy, but that is water over the dam, as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has said. I think it is a shame today that we have seen the blame for three great wars placed upon a certain side of this aisle. I cannot help but remember during my short tenure of being a Member of this House the cry from a certain side of this House asking for economy, economy, economy, when 70 percent of our budget was going for the military, and we were hearing from the well of this House constantly the words that we must have a balanced budget, that we must reduce military spending, we must reduce domestic spending. I agree with our distinguished chairman that every dollar we can save domestically now must be saved, but I can say to you now that there are a lot of prophets here in the House of Representatives, and I am one of them, that have a great hindsight as to what has happened during the past 2 years, and I think the sooner we lay aside partisan politics and pass this legislation that is coming from our committee, and we forget the bitterness that has taken

place in the past, that we are going to be sure of victory; whether it is next year or 10 years from now. We may be in for a long, long duration; we may never see peace in our times, but it is up to us as Members of this Congress to vote every cent possible for military preparation. This war may be tomorrow on a universal scale; it may be 6 months, it may be 1 year from now, and we pray to God it will never be, but I heard our distinguished chairman say yesterday, in executive session, that by being strong we may preserve the peace of this Nation. It is only, gentlemen, by remaining strong, that we have any hope at all for peace.

I hope this legislation is promptly enacted by the House today.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That portion of section 1422 of the Revised Statutes (18 Stat. 484) which reads as follows: "All persons who shall be so detained beyond their terms of enlistment or who shall, after the termination of their enlistment, voluntarily reenter to serve until the return to an Atlantic or Pacific port of the vessel to which they belong, and their regular discharge therefrom, shall receive for the time during which they are so detained, or shall so serve beyond their original terms of enlistment, an addition of one-fourth of their former pay;" shall be suspended with respect to enlistments extended in accordance with this act.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill, that it be printed in the Record at this point, and that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this first bill of a group we are to pass is a very serious measure. We are changing the contract we made with enlisted men in the armed services because of dire necessity, involving the security of our country, in carrying out our mission under the United Nations. We had better bear that in mind when later we come to other contracts that may be need to be changed because of such necessity.

There has been discussion here about lowering the drain on defense dollars. I have a suggestion I should like to make along that line, and I hope I may have the attention of the distinguished members of the Committee on Armed Services. I want to recall some recent history that will, I am sure, entail no debate or recrimination, because the House action was unanimous. This was on an amendment I offered in committee that was unanimously adopted there, and when it came to the floor as a committee amendment on August 18, 1949, it was unanimously adopted in the House, and when we went to conference it was unanimously adopted there.

Last year we were considering the mutual defense assistance bill and I offered what I then called the "anti-five" per-

cent or "anti-deep-freeze amendment." I want to read it. This is section 412 of what is now Public Law 329 of the Eighty-first Congress, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949:

Whoever offers or gives to anyone who is now or in the past 2 years has been an employee or officer of the United States any commission, payment, or gift, in connection with the procurement of equipment, materials, or services under this act, and whoever, being or having been an employee or officer of the United States in the past 2 years, solicits, accepts, or offers to accept any such commission, payment, or gift, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not to exceed \$10,000 or imprisonment for not to exceed 3 years, or both.

That amendment both in committee and in conference was objected to by the executive departments. They said it was too broad. However, both Houses of the Congress in their wisdom adopted that amendment exactly as I had drafted it. In conference I said that, if experience showed it was too broad, we could have amendments brought in when mutual defense assistance was extended this year. No such recommendations came from the executive departments this year when the act was extended. Apparently my original amendment is not too broad.

However, it is confined solely to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. Note that it is limited to "procurement under this act." It seems to me that at this time, when we are changing the contracts of enlisted men, when we are thinking of changing other contracts, and when we want to conserve the defense dollar, we ought, before any trouble or scandal or suspicion starts, to put into the laws that come from our great Committee on Armed Services such a provision as this. It will take care of those who are already like vultures over the kill, starting to circle around the Capital to see what pickings they can make out of war contracts. Many patriotic businessmen are offering their plants to provide what we need. Their offers should be considered on their merits and on our needs. We do not want word to get around that they have to see the right people who can put on the fix. We ought at least to provide that there are not going to be any deals between those persons and those that are now officers or have been officers or employees of the Government, so there will not be any 5 percent or any other arrangements made. Therefore we should put a strong measure into the legislation which I hope will come from the Committee on Armed Services in a few days, a deterrent to prevent any persons inside or outside the Government from falling under the temptation of using improper means to secure contracts for this great effort we are about to enter.

I hope that will be done. It is my purpose in speaking at this time to urge our Committee on Armed Services to incorporate promptly in the first legislation which would be appropriate, some such prohibition and some such language so that right from the start it will be made clear to the public and the people that, while we are drafting our boys to fight, while we in substance are draft-

ing our volunteers to fight longer than they contracted for, we are going to prevent anyone from getting any improper profit out of this great effort.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that I will introduce tomorrow a bill dealing with the question of renegotiation providing that every contract not only for armaments but every other contract of the Government will be subject to renegotiation. We should try to write into law something that will prohibit and stop this situation of 5 percenters on Government contracts.

Mr. VORYS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has given a most comprehensive report on the current diplomatic and military situation now confronting the Nation and the world.

I do not desire at this time to elaborate upon his remarks and recommendations which I know have made a very deep impression upon this House as they will upon the country. But in view of the great crisis which faces us as a Nation, I feel bound as a member of the Armed Services Committee to present, or rather to reiterate in substance some very concrete views regarding the world situation which I have held for some time and which upon many occasions I have heretofore expressed.

First, let me say that I agree that there is no further time to lose in putting the resources and strength of this Nation into a full state of preparation to meet any and every contingency. The world about us is threatening any day, any moment, to break out into another dreadful conflagration. The ruthless, tyrannical forces of organized world communism have spread their tentacles far and wide over the face of the earth. They have subjugated and enslaved millions of helpless peoples. Their demonstrated aim is world conquest. Only America, and America standing practically alone, has the power, the strength, the will and purpose to bar the way to these evil forces from reaching their goal and enslaving Americans and all other free peoples and destroying the civilization which has been built up throughout the centuries with so much sacrifice and bloodshed.

Certainly the present situation requires immediate and vigorous action by Congress and the Executive. We must move with utmost dispatch. There can be no delay. We can brook no interference. We can tolerate no disloyalty. We can shelter no half-heartedness. There must be an immediate full-scaled, intensive, yes, I will say advisedly, an urgent, united effort to build up a military force and an industrial potential that will be able and adequate to protect and defend this Nation and carry out our commitments for the defense of human liberty and our free way of life.

Military and economic power is not enough to cope with this situation, in-

dispensable as this is. We must have an immediate clarification of foreign policy designed to inform the American people and the world, clearly and frankly, of our objectives for the attainment of a peaceful world through cooperative international action and the neutralization of Communist efforts to enslave mankind. Early stepping up of our activities to bring accurate information and enlightenment to all peoples is highly desirable.

Measures to protect the internal security are most urgent, immediately mandatory. We cannot permit Trojan horses filled with Communist conspirators to rove through this Nation ready at a signal to disgorge a flood of sabotage and destruction upon our communications, our vital public services, and our national defense industries. This is of paramount importance now. Every appropriate Government agency, national, State, and local, must be organized, mobilized, and alerted to combat these internal enemies who threaten us so despicably from within. It is also very essential that we immediately organize civilian defense and disaster components.

Our armed services, all of them, must be alerted to the possibilities of further attack anywhere. Let us wake up. Anything can happen at any moment, and for God's sake let us be ready. Let us not be taken again by surprise.

Let us marshal all our strength, build additional forces as the world situation requires, and unite the entire American people and the decent, freedom-loving peoples of the world against the evils of organized Communist tyranny.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be allotted to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the gentleman's statement that he expects on tomorrow to introduce a bill which will reactivate renegotiation. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. It has already been prepared. If we did not have this bill up here this afternoon, I would drop it in the hopper this afternoon. The gentleman understands that his committee already has a provision written in law that all contracts relating to the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the fiscal year 1951 are subject to renegotiation. But this is broader and applies to all Government contracts.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is this a complete reactivation of the renegotiation statute as we developed it during World War II?

Mr. VINSON. It is along the same line as was established before and the whole thing is considered along that line. It is very constructive legislation and

comes from Secretary Symington's hands.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course the gentleman recalls that we instituted renegotiation by a very simple amendment at the outset during the consideration of the sixth supplemental defense bill in 1942, and it was revised in a tax bill by the Committee on Ways and Means in 1943. It became quite a broad statute covering all phases of defense procurement. Does this bill cover the same scope?

Mr. VINSON. This is so broad that while I think the Committee on Armed Services might have jurisdiction, I today requested the Speaker of the House that even though our committee did have jurisdiction to refer the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the information the gentleman has given. I am glad to know that steps are being taken in that direction. As the gentleman knows, I was much concerned in the development of the renegotiation statute.

Mr. VINSON. May I say in this connection I think it was the gentleman's amendment which started the whole thing during the World War. The gentleman is entitled to recognition for having originated it, or at least putting it in the statute. The gentleman has always been strong for renegotiation. But we must go one step further in this preparedness program—and that is all this is—we must stop, by language, if it can so be drafted, people—or to use the expression of the gentleman from Ohio—almost vultures, standing around here trying to make 5 percent or 10 percent out of Government contracts. It is the most difficult thing to find language to cover it. We went through it in World War II. But something along that line, as well as renegotiation should be enacted as early as possible. The House and the country can just understand that we have to enter into a worthwhile preparedness defensive program and the first thought of the Congress and the Nation has to be the defense of this country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is no question about that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. At this point, since this legislation is before the House, I want to urge, in view of the report of the Comptroller General, that we see to it that in any legislation which is passed the Comptroller General shall have a right to go into these matters more fully than has been true in the past.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I also hope that is incorporated in the bill.

As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has suggested, I followed the development of the renegotiation proposition from the outset. Again, in 1948 when we provided funds for a 17-group air force, we reactivated renegotiation for the procurement under the speed-up funds then provided. Unfortunately,

the 1948 money for the 70-group air force was frozen, in large part, and that is partly responsible for the situation we have today.

We were also distressed in the Appropriations Committee, in the spring of 1948, to find that other money which had been provided for research and development was being used for other purposes under direction of the President's Budget Bureau. Gen. Curtis LeMay, who was in charge of the strategic air command at that time, testified in our hearings that this taking of the funds away from research and development set back that program at least 18 months. And the President wrote a letter to agency heads restricting them to supporting budget action. Today we are paying some of the price for that.

Now, it is not a matter of bringing up these matters to show we had foresight, but it is to let the people know how things could be different. The American people are interested in knowing how they can get some assurance that these mistakes will not be repeated in the future. We will not avoid them unless they are recognized.

I have here a letter which I received from the comptroller of the Air Force under date of April 8, 1950, in response to my own letter of April 6, 1950, in regard to the effect of the freezing of the Air Force funds for this fiscal year 1950. When we return to the House I shall ask permission to place that in the RECORD at this point. It shows the effect of the freezing of the \$735,000,000 which the Congress, and I may say on the initiative of the House of Representatives, put into the appropriation bill for the defense establishment last year. I shall also insert a letter from the Treasury giving the record on the expenditures for the first 6 months of this year. The letters referred to follow:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1950.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: This is in reply to your letter of April 6, 1950, in which you requested information regarding Department of the Air Force fiscal year 1950 funds which were frozen by the President.

Following the enactment of the fiscal year 1950 appropriations bill, the President directed the Secretary of Defense to reserve the additional funds added by the Congress to the President's 48 group budget for the purpose of building up toward a 58 group Air Force. As a result, the following funds were placed in reserve.

Appropriation:

Construction of aircraft and related procurement.....	\$577,755,000
Special procurement.....	8,338,000
Maintenance and operations.....	130,928,000
Research and development.....	18,000,000
Contingencies.....	733,000
Total	735,754,000

Had the Air Force been authorized to obligate the entire appropriations enacted by the Congress for fiscal year 1950, the aircraft-procurement program for that fiscal year would have been expanded from 1,250 to 1,832 aircraft and the Air Force would have continued its build-up toward a 58 group level.

In the case of research and development, the reservation of funds in this appropriation resulted in the slowing down of the rate of development, and, in some instances, the elimination of certain projects.

The placing of these funds in reserve had no effect on the radar screen, and this program is being prosecuted as originally planned. However, it should be pointed out that the fiscal year 1950 appropriations bill did not provide funds specifically for this activity. Provision was made in the bill, however, for the transfer to the "acquisition and construction of real property" appropriation of the funds required to finance this program. Such action necessitated the reprogramming of activities in the "aircraft and related procurement" and "maintenance and operations" appropriations to the extent necessary to finance the fiscal year 1950 increment of the radar screen.

The total amount which the conferees of the House and the Senate added to the appropriation estimates of the Department of the Air Force for fiscal year 1950, as passed by the Congress, was \$735,754,000. The amount set aside in reserve by direction of the President also totaled \$735,754,000.

Sincerely yours,
E. W. RAWLINGS,
Lieutenant General, United States
Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff,
Comptroller.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FISCAL SERVICE,
Washington, July 12, 1950.

HON. JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Room 1126, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TABER: Pursuant to your telephone request, I am enclosing a table that shows the budget estimates of January 1950 for the fiscal year 1950, compared with actual receipts and expenditures for that fiscal year, on the basis of daily Treasury statement classifications.

I hope this will give you the information that you desire.

Very truly yours,
E. F. BARTELT,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

Actual budget receipts and expenditures,
fiscal year 1950, compared with budget
estimates of January 1950

[In millions of dollars]

Classification	Actual fiscal year 1950	Budget esti- mates of Janu- ary 1950
Receipts:		
Internal revenue:		
Income tax:		
Withheld by employers.....	10,073	9,830
Other.....	18,189	19,307
Miscellaneous internal revenue.....	8,303	8,328
Social security taxes:		
Employment taxes.....	2,106	2,245
Tax on employers of 8 or more.....	226	223
Taxes upon carriers and their employees.....	550	570
Railroad unemployment insurance contributions for administrative expenses.....	9	10
Customs.....	423	375
Surplus property (act Oct. 3, 1944).....	264	224
Other miscellaneous receipts.....	1,166	1,065
Total budget receipts.....	41,311	42,185
Deduct:		
Appropriation to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.....	2,106	2,245
Refunds of receipts.....	2,160	2,177
Net budget receipts.....	37,045	37,763

Actual budget receipts and expenditures,
fiscal year 1950, compared with budget
estimates of January 1950—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Classification	Actual fiscal year 1950	Budget esti- mates of Janu- ary 1950
Expenditures:		
Legislative establishment.....	56	62
The Judiciary.....	24	24
Agriculture Department:		
Farmers Home Administration.....	182	160
Production and Marketing Administration:		
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	1,713	1,556
Other.....	516	528
Rural Electrification Administration.....	293	362
Other.....	356	347
Atomic Energy Commission.....	524	673
Civil Service Commission:		
Employees' retirement funds (United States share).....	303	303
Other.....	21	23
Commerce Department:		
Civil Aeronautics.....	166	193
Maritime Activities.....	94	162
Public Roads.....	486	508
Other.....	125	133
Defense Department:		
Office of the Secretary of Defense:		
Retired pay—military services.....	150	206
Other.....	11	11
Air Force.....	3,506	3,745
Army.....	5,704	6,151
Navy.....	4,125	4,413
Economic Cooperation Administration:		
Economic Cooperation Act.....	3,523	3,895
Other.....	29	181
Executive Office of the President:		
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	8	12
Other.....	45	71
Federal Security Agency:		
Social Security Administration.....	1,154	1,175
Other.....	277	308
General Services Administration.....	588	797
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Office of Administrator.....	2	17
Federal Housing Administration.....	3	18
Home Loan Bank Board.....	275	197
Public Housing Administration.....		113
Interior Department:		
Bureau of Reclamation.....	300	334
Other.....	276	304
Justice Department.....	131	135
Korean aid.....	40	70
Labor Department.....	258	218
Mutual defense assistance.....	44	160
Post Office Department (deficiency).....	593	568
Railroad Retirement Board:		
Railroad retirement account.....	583	602
Other.....	13	11
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	589	1,034
State Department.....	339	365
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	18	62
Treasury Department:		
Interest on the public debt.....	5,750	5,725
Other.....	670	663
Veterans' Administration:		
National service life insurance fund.....	473	511
Other.....	6,044	6,255
Other agencies.....	336	438
Total budget expenditures.....	40,167	43,297
Budget deficit.....	3,122	5,533

¹ Based upon net transactions. On comparable basis with expenditures in daily Treasury statements this figure would be \$166,000,000.

² Excess of credits, deduct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to impose upon your time at this time for 5 minutes, but I do believe

I should make my position clear in this matter right now, once and for all.

First of all, I want to make this statement. Ten years I have sat at the feet of the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON; 10 years I have sat at the feet of the greatest chairman that any committee has ever had in the history of this Nation. I will say to you that the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, has exhibited more vision than all the Presidents and all the members of the executive branch on matters of defense, since time began. He built for this Nation the largest Navy the world has ever known. It kicked from the seas everything the Japanese had, and it roamed the Pacific at will. He built the largest Marine Corps and naval air arm this Nation has ever had. He was the leader in this 70-group air-force fight. He wanted to give the Nation the best Air Force the world could provide. He wanted to give the Nation the best Army the world could provide. But his advice was not heeded, and we might just as well face the facts. Who is responsible for that? The executive branch of the Government, and you know it. I want to say right here and now that I will not have any part of that.

Mr. ELSTON. I think the gentleman will agree that every member of the Committee on the Armed Services supported our chairman; did he not?

Mr. RIVERS. I was coming to that. With very few exceptions in each of the 10 years I have served on the committee, 6 with the Committee on Naval Affairs, we got more bills passed through this Congress than any committee in the history of all the Congresses of the United States, as the gentleman from Missouri well knows. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] saw to that. He, with his great leadership, tells you this bill is necessary and you will follow him; certainly I shall. But I want the world to know, I want the Nation to know, that the Committee on Armed Services is not responsible for the debacle this country faces today; it is the executive branch of the Government, not the Congress of the United States, or the Armed Services Committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON.

This is not a time for recrimination; you know that, and I know that; but we have got to go forward; we have got to face the facts which my chairman has called to your attention. We are in one bad situation; only a miracle can save us in Korea. You know that, but I want the records to be crystal-clear that had the executive branch of Government followed the leadership of CARL VINSON this Nation today could tell the world where to go in a very few minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think the gentleman overstated what he said about the chairman of this committee. Does the gentleman recall of a single bill brought out of this committee that we did not accept?

Mr. RIVERS. I know of none, and we are going to accept this one; all Americans are.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. RIVERS. We appropriated money here, but it was withheld by the executive branch of the Government. We might just as well face the fact. We have got that same ox in the ditch, the very same one the gentleman from Georgia was talking about; and you and I have got to pull that same ox out of the ditch. But I want no part of the blame for our present situation to be saddled on the Congress of the United States; it cannot be, and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized.

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BROWN.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time because I have been extremely interested in the debate which is taking place here today, a debate which I believe may be good for the American people and the future peace of the world. I have been especially interested in the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the remarks of the Republican member of the committee on the Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH], and those of the gentleman from South Carolina, also a member of the committee [Mr. RIVERS].

I wish at the very outset to say to you that America is at the crossroads; indeed, the whole world is at the crossroads today. These are critical hours. I am sure every individual Member of Congress, yea, every American citizen, is behind our boys in uniform who are fighting alone today. I have my own ideas as to how this state of affairs came about; and, if I desired, perhaps I could be quite critical of some persons and some of the policies responsible for our being where we are, but the fact remains American boys are fighting 7,000 miles away from home with their backs to the sea, and that we are trying to do something about it, and to give them the equipment and the tools of war with which to defend their lives.

I regret—yes, I deeply regret—that while we are engaged in fighting the spread of communism in Korea 7,000 miles away, for some reason or other some people are dragging their feet here at home, and we are encountering difficulty in our attempts to get brought up in the Congress for consideration the measures which would at least restrict the activities of those Communists and their helpers who would destroy us from within while our foreign foes seek to destroy us from without. But this is not a time to attempt to fix blame or responsibility for that which has gone on before. I am sure the American people in their wisdom will reach a decision in due time as to who is responsible and who is to blame.

We now have before us a bill to break the contract, or the word, of the Government of the United States, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] has pointed out, with the American boys who have voluntarily entered the armed services in recent months and years. That sort of legislation cannot be approached lightly, as I am sure the gentleman from Georgia will agree. In that connection, because we are going to pass this bill—that seems apparent—I believe it is necessary that the American people know certain things.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, the American people should know the Congress provided a ceiling of approximately 2,000,000 men for the Armed Forces, and that of this date we are nearly 600,000 men below that ceiling. It is not the responsibility of or because of any failure of the Congress of the United States that this particular situation exists.

I hope the chairman of the great Committee on the Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], will point out later in his remarks, either on this bill or on the bill which follows, just what the Congress has done to provide for the defense of this country. I suggest this because I am fearful that once we vote the powers and the appropriations being requested by the administration, and perhaps the Congress adjourns, as the majority leader suggested yesterday, so we will no longer have the opportunity and the benefit of free debate in the well of this House, or on the floor of the other body, some officials may attempt to place the responsibility and the blame for the mistakes and the failures of the past and present, on the Congress of the United States. I do not want that to happen. So I feel it is time we make it clear here and now that certain things have been done by the Congress for the common defense.

This Congress did pass the Unification Act at the request of the administration, and I would like to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that I went along with the administration on the passage of that act when the gentleman, in his wisdom, pointed out the dangers involved. I am not so sure we were as wise as we thought in the action we took in following the request of the administration in this connection. Perhaps the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services had much clearer vision and better judgment at that time than some of the rest of us.

We enacted the stockpiling bill under which practically nothing has been done. And, as I mentioned a moment ago, we voted more manpower, about 600,000 more men, for the armed services, than the military has seen fit to call to the colors. Our military leaders could now have 2,000,000 trained men under arms if they had seen fit to use the authority Congress voted them. We have appropriated, and Chairman VINSON, I want you to correct me if I am wrong, something like \$1,500,000,000 more money for the National Defense Establishment,

since World War II ended, than has been spent or obligated by that agency.

I believe the gentleman from Georgia will agree with me, and I want the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH] to listen to this if he is here, that never once, regardless of the political party Members might belong to, was there more than one single vote against any defense appropriation or any defense measure during the war years.

I would like also to point out with all the vigor at my command that the Congress has gone along on every other request of the military and the administration to strengthen our national defense. For instance, we set up the Central Intelligence Agency to keep America informed as to what was going on throughout the world.

We also created the National Security Council during the Eightieth Congress. In order that we might give security to our Nation and to our people, we also set up the National Security Resources Board, so we might be prepared in a material way in case of danger.

Oh, yes, we voted more naval aircraft and plane carriers than have been constructed. It was not the Congress who refused to continue such construction or ordered the partially finished aircraft carriers abandoned; that was another agency of the Government.

We have appropriated nearly \$60,000,000,000 for national defense purposes since the war ended; and we provided, if you please, sirs, for a 70-group air force, not once, but three different times. It was not until just a week or so ago, not until then, that we finally did get the consent of the administration to go ahead with the 70-group air force program.

We have spent about \$35,000,000,000 on economic and other aid for foreign countries, because we were told we had to decide whether we wanted to spend a few billion dollars now for economic aid to guarantee peace, or whether, instead, we wanted to spend \$100,000,000,000 or much more each year for war. Well, that program simply has not worked out. At least it certainly has not given us a peaceful world or eliminated the dangerous threat of world war III. And I am not unmindful, Mr. Chairman, in fact, I rather resent deep down in my heart, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the fact that the American boys who are fighting and dying on the battlefields in Korea today, with their backs to the sea, do not have a single soldier from a single nation we have helped so much, outside of Korea fighting alongside them. That is a sad and disillusioning situation.

May I also point out that not more than 6 or 7 weeks ago a committee of this Congress was told the military budget for next year would not be any larger than it was for this year, and perhaps considerably less. Neither am I unmindful of the fact that the military leaders of our Nation more than a year ago told us Korea was not defensible, and was of no strategic value to us. It was upon their orders, not ours, that American troops were withdrawn from Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on and talk about many other things the Congress has done in the belief we were contributing to the building of an adequate national defense, and I could point out numerous high-level mistakes of the past to show the responsibility for the present unsatisfactory situation which exists today does not rest upon the Congress. I hope that the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, able as he is, will point in measured words, for the benefit of this Congress and the country, a complete list of the many things the Congress of the United States has done to strengthen our national defense and to assure the security of the American people. Such action is important, Mr. Chairman, and, I am sure, will be most helpful to a proper understanding of what has gone on before, what our present defense situation really is, and what we must do to prepare for the days ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] made one of the finest speeches that I have ever listened to in this House, and I want the membership of this House to know that I am following his leadership 100 percent in regard to this emergency bill.

I think some things that have been brought up during this debate, particularly by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], a dear friend of mine, should be considered by this House. In the first place, the United States is committed to the principle of the United Nations. Rightly or wrongly we are committed to it.

Now, let us consider Korea. Who drew the thirty-eighth parallel line in Korea? Who approved it? Was it the United States? It was approved by the United Nations. Then there happens to be another principle of the United Nations, and that is the self-determination of peoples. When the people of the free Republic of South Korea wanted to hold an election, we participated under the auspices of the United Nations in holding that free election in July of 1948, over 2 years ago, and the free Republic of South Korea was born, and the North Korean Republic refused to let the United Nations come in to supervise and see that their election was free. So, some other forces have been at work besides our own. Of course, when that constitutional government was established in Korea we withdrew our troops, because our military people said that we had no business there; it was a country on its own, and later on we went in only in an advisory position.

Now I want to ask the gentlemen who are finding so much fault with the situation as it has developed in Korea would they be willing at this time to mass 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 men on the east-west German line in anticipation of something which might happen? If that something did happen, would the Monday morning quarterbacks say we were at fault because we did not mass those

2,000,000 men on the east-west German line?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to answer the gentleman's challenge.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Once aggression took place in Korea from the Communist-led people in the north, the United Nations appealed to the member nations of the United Nations to oppose that aggression. Because we are probably the greatest and most powerful and outstanding nation that is supporting the true principles of the United Nations, we responded to that call, and we are doing the best we can. We did not pick the battleground, we did not pick the murky weather, we did not pick the swamps or mountains of Korea in which to fight. Someone else picked that battleground, and picked it by aggressive action. We are doing our best to oppose it.

The program of opposition to communism since World War II ended is an all-over program. It is not just a military action in Korea, it is not just an occupation in Germany, it is not an airlift to Berlin, it is an all-over program. It is an economic program to strengthen those nations of Europe that are known as the ECA nations, so that they can resist communism within their own borders, so that they can sustain constitutional government and the freedom and liberty of their people.

I want to ask some of these Monday morning quarterbacks like my good friend from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], how did he vote on the motion to recommit the Korean aid bill? How did he vote on economic aid to the ECA countries in Europe? How did he follow through on the Korean aid bill, I should like to know.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; I voted against the Korean aid bill. Many of the staunchest supporters of the United Nations voted against it. I voted against it for the reason that it was absolutely silly to send economic aid to build up a rich prize over there unless you were ready to defend it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right; how about the European ECA bill?

Mr. SHORT. I voted against it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman says he wanted military aid to Korea, but he is not committing himself on how he was calling the play on the economic aid to Europe the purpose of which was to defeat communism within the borders of Europe.

Yes; and there is something else I want to call to the attention of the gentleman, and that is the economy drive. What caused the mothballing of planes? What caused the mothballing of battleships and cruisers? It was the economy drive of the gentleman from Missouri and his colleagues of the same persuasion.

Mr. SHORT. I will tell the gentleman why: Because the Eightieth Congress voted more than this administration would spend.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman does not want to hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes, so I may answer my friend from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman cannot entertain that request, because the time for debate has been allotted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The fact is the President cut back \$735,000,000 in our air program that we offered last year. He impounded it. General Johnson impounded it at the suggestion and recommendation of the Chief Executive for economy. There is where your economy comes from.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in answer to what the gentleman from California said about the situation in Europe and Germany, I want to simply go on record saying again, as I said before, long ago we should have been taking steps to build up a military potential in western Germany.

Under permission granted by the House, I place here a colloquy which took place between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and myself during the debate on the military aid bill, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 17, 1949, a year ago:

Mr. Judd. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is western Germany included, and if not, why not?

Mr. Judd. Western Germany is not included. You can think of some obvious reasons, of course. Probably the best natural defense line available is the Rhine. That is a sizable barrier, but most of the German armament plants are east of that barrier. I think it is understood that the German economy will contribute basic things, such as coal, steel, chemicals, and so forth, but not finished armaments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Where is the greatest industrial-producing capacity for armaments in Europe?

Mr. Judd. The greatest industrial-producing capacity for armaments is in Germany, but unfortunately it is in an area which because of our retreat from defense barriers further east like the Elbe, could not be kept under our control.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Where is the greatest reserve of trained fighting manpower in Europe?

Mr. Judd. Excepting Russia, it is in Germany.

So, I will say to the gentleman from California that it is not hindsight today to point out that we should have been doing something in western Germany while the Russians were building up their so-called police force in eastern Germany—and there were earlier observations by the Member from South Dakota in the Herter committee report of 1947-48.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor again to try to straighten out the record on what the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] had to say, I think about me, a while ago when he was on the floor. I asked him to yield to me and he did not. In no way did I inject politics in my statement when I raised the question as to what had occurred to the moneys that have been appropriated. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] directed me to read the editorials of the newspapers for information for the people in my district. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois I am a little bit more energetic than that, and anyone who knows me would know better than to challenge me in such a way. I do not generally inject politics into my statements here. I try to get some facts. He has referred us to editorials.

The distinguished chairman of the committee said that his committee was going into this problem and I accepted that as a complete answer to my question. Also, I see that the distinguished committee of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is a member, is not going to depend upon newspaper editorials for their answers, either. Then the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH]—I just read his statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I would like to say this to him, not as advice but as a mere suggestion: As he goes down through life, it might be well for him to consider the errors of the past when he is dealing with the dollars put up by the stockholders or taxpayers or bond buyers. There are three groups who like to know what their dollars are used for. If the gentleman ever becomes a success industrially, he will certainly try to find out who made the error, instead of washing the thing out and paying no attention to the errors of the past as he appropriates for the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. I think it is appropriate for me briefly to call the attention of the Members of the House to two votes. First, I call your attention to the vote on aid to Korea on January 19, 1950. The vote "aye" was 191. The vote "no" was 193. It lost by only two votes. The second vote was on February 9, 1950. The "aye" vote was 240, and the "no" vote 134.

My suggestion is that all of us ought to hesitate very emphatically at this tragic time in the world's history before being hypercritical of what mistakes may or may not have been made. History itself will best be the judge of events of the past. Some of the gentlemen who today are saying things designed to condemn and find fault with others are those who voted against the proposed help of 60,000 to Korea just in January and February of this year. I think some of us ought to review what we did on those two occasions. Self-inspection will remove much criticism of others. Let us not be partisan. Let us be truly objective.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I am sorry I cannot yield to my friend from Pennsylvania. I would like to yield but the time is limited.

Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues have spoken about the mistakes that have been made, particularly by the Defense Department and the State Department. Hindsight is a whole lot better than foresight. We can look back at a lot of mistakes that have been made, and I suppose it may be a question of judgment to determine whether they were mistakes. I can think of a good many things that have occurred during the past few years that seem to me to have been mistakes. I think if they had been handled differently, we might be in a better situation today. Some of the questions raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] are difficult, if not impossible to answer. But I do not think it does us much good at this moment to enumerate mistakes, or to focus too much attention on them in this critical hour.

We need to think about them. We need to take action to prevent their recurrence. And to the extent that the same people who made those mistakes are governing our policies now, we need to make some changes. But let us not air this on the floor of the House when our tempers become a little frayed. Mine does occasionally. My chairman called that to my attention in committee yesterday, so I am going to try to be careful, because, like my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], I have learned a great deal under Mr. Vinson's tutelage. However, there are a few things that I think should be mentioned. Not all of the mistakes have been made by the Defense Establishment. I think some of them have been made in the Congress, and I want to mention one that we made in this Congress, in my judgment. I think we made a mistake when we amended the Unification Act. We did that. Perhaps we were a little gullible. Perhaps we were influenced by the demand for economy. Perhaps we placed a little too much confidence in the report of the Hoover Commission as to what savings could be accomplished. Whatever may have been the reason, we did it. I have a deep and abiding conviction that some of our immediate difficulties stem from that very act, and perhaps we ought to change it again. But out of this unification squabble—and it was a squabble—arose the hearings which were conducted by the Committee on Armed Services not so long ago, starting out with the so-called B-36 investigation, and then going into a study of unification.

What was the real question about unification? It was a struggle between the components of the Military Establishment to put into effect their interpretations of what unification meant. We did a great deal of good in those hearings. In my humble judgment, if it had not been for those hearings the Navy would have been scuttled. We would not have any Marine Corps. Maybe that is a little strong, but, thank God, we had those hearings, and thank God we had a chairman who would pursue that thing

to a conclusion and come up with recommendations, and stand firmly by those recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. I thank you very much. I do not want to take all of my chairman's time, but I would like to conclude with one or two observations.

In the Armed Services Committee we are not frustrated with politics. When we are dealing with national defense we must not permit political considerations to be injected. We do not do it in the committee. Let us not do it in the House. Let us come forth and correct the errors that have been made and take steps to prevent a repetition of those errors. Let us do the best that we can now and do it quickly, to meet whatever the needs may be immediately before us. Let us prepare ourselves to the fullest to meet any threat, wherever it may occur in the world. But let us not so concentrate our strength in one spot as to become too weak in another—more important and more vulnerable spot. We are receiving help from some other nations, but let us keep in mind this fact, that whether or not we have the support of the other members of the United Nations, we have no course except to stand up and fight for the democracy that we enjoy, to fight against the encroachment of communism wherever it may arise. Any other course leads us to eventual destruction and slavery.

Let me express my appreciation to my chairman for yielding me these few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED].

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services I could not remain silent here this afternoon and not say a few words. In the beginning let me state that I did not rise in a spirit of criticism toward anyone, although I think constructive criticism is oftentimes very good; but I do want to say that since I have been, for just a short time, on the Committee on Armed Services I have been impressed with the leadership of the majority and also of the minority on that committee. As my distinguished colleague from Virginia said a moment ago, we have not had any politics on that committee in the bills that have come from that committee. When those bills have come up on the floor of the House you have seen both sides of the aisle fighting for those bills to go through. I think it is a tribute to both parties and the House that that has existed.

I voted for aid to Korea, I voted for the Marshall plan, I have voted with the administration on many measures although I have consistently fought against the so-called civil rights issues and I expect to do so as a southerner as long as I am here on the floor of the House.

We have had distinguished leadership on our committee. How easy it would be for the gentleman from Georgia to stand here on the floor today and tell you: "Yes, I told you so long ago; I have been telling you this all along." Instead of that, what does he do? Does he stand here and tell you about the money that we appropriated that was not used, although he knows it full well? He wrote me back in December of last year when I was at Tuscaloosa, Ala., to please write him and give him some of my reactions to the investigation that we had just had, and I wrote him this, among other things, and I quote from my letter of which I sent a copy to every member of the Committee on Armed Services:

The responsibility of Congress for appropriations should remain inviolate. Steps should be taken by Congress to retain unimpaired use of this responsibility. The Bureau of the Budget has an important function to perform but should not be permitted to control the amount of the appropriation. When Congress appropriates money for certain designated agencies and uses, neither the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, nor any other person or department should be permitted to limit or curtail or reduce the expenditure or use of such appropriation as designated by the Congress.

I wrote that last December, and it was not hindsight when I wrote that letter. We in the Armed Services Committee knew that some of the money that was being appropriated by this Congress was not being used, had not been used. I have figures here to show where it had not been used. I do not criticize any particular individual for this, because no doubt the administration was trying to do like many members of the minority party and many members of the majority party, reduce expenditures where it could possibly do so. In reducing those expenditures the administration was trying to act in the best interests of our country. The point, however, is that we, the Congress, have the responsibility for the appropriations. If we appropriate too much, that is our responsibility, and if we appropriate too little that is our responsibility; but the executive branch of the Government should not have the right to control the appropriations of Congress, because it is given to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

The situation in Korea is bad. Whose fault it is it will do no good to say. Our chairman has taken this position, and rightfully so. I think it would not do any good for him to stand here and tell you about what he has been trying to get done that has not been done. He says action must be taken now regardless of whose fault it was that we failed of action in the past; that we have got to get our program under way. That is the position we have got to take in this Congress.

The bill before us today is not a pleasant bill to vote for.

As has been pointed out, these men have a contract that has expired or will expire and we are requiring them by our votes here today to extend that contract.

Many of them we are placing in a position of danger by casting our votes. We are extending their contracts knowing that we are placing many of them in a position of danger. But we have got to think about our country's welfare above everything else. It will not do to have those men discharged over there now from the service when they are performing their duty and in the middle of it be sent back here and force us to send over other men. There are probably some 40,000 or more men—I do not know the exact number—that could be discharged from the forces over there in Japan or in Korea, although many of them would reenlist. We cannot afford to lose any of them now. So acting in what I think is our best interest and in the best interest of our country's welfare I intend to vote for and support this measure, although I do it with reluctance.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. YOUNG, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3937) to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill, H. R. 9177, will be laid upon the table, it being similar to a Senate bill passed by the House.

There was no objection.

SUSPENDING RESTRICTIONS ON THE AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. VINSON. 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. 9178) to suspend the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9178, with Mr. WHITTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this bill will result in the extended debate that the previous bill produced, although I think it was highly important that we had that debate. Later on we are going to have more debate and it is going to be pinpointed more than this recent debate was.

Now, this is the second bill before the House as a result of the Korean war.

It is another measure which responds to the needs imposed upon our country by the difficulties we face in the world.

I will explain very briefly the need for the legislation and what its effect will be.

Existing law fixes a statutory ceiling of 2,005,882 on the personnel strengths of the Armed Forces. That authority is contained in the Selective Service Act and in the Army-Air Force Composition bill approved only a couple of weeks ago by the President.

That two million ceiling is composed of these strengths in each of the armed services.

The Army's ceiling is 837,000. The Navy's ceiling is 666,882. The Air Force's ceiling is 502,000.

The build-up of our Armed Forces envisaged under the program recommended by the President last week will exceed these strength ceilings in each service except possibly in the Army.

As regards the Army, the build-up will come so close to the present ceiling, under present plans, that a slight increase in manpower needs would exceed the statutory limit. It is necessary, therefore, to suspend these ceilings, and this bill does that for an indefinite period.

In the meantime, after enactment of this measure, the strength of our Armed Forces will still be governed by available funds. As a result, the Congress will at all times have clear-cut control over the extent to which the Armed Forces will expand.

This legislation is a precautionary measure taken in advance to meet, first, the present plans to strengthen the Armed Forces, as proposed by the President in his July 19 message, and, second, to provide the statutory leeway that will be required should a much larger expansion of the Armed Forces become necessary in the future.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, whether this committee has given or plans to give consideration to the restoration of the dependency payments.

Mr. VINSON. We have not reached that yet. If through the draft or through the ordering into Federal service of the Reserves or National Guard that question gets acute, we will promptly give it consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. For the time being we have not gotten around to it because we

are concentrating right now to find out how much strength we actually have and how much more we have to get.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. I was very pleased to note where the Marine Corps is going to be increased by 57,000. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if anything is contemplated being done along the line of his committee suggestion that the Commandant of the Marine Corps be given a voice on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. VINSON. I introduced a bill to do that, and it has the support of an overwhelming majority of the members of the Armed Services Committee. But, we have been so bogged down with other matters that we just have not gotten around to it. We just cannot detour to handle those kinds of things right now when the house is on fire, and we have to get busy to put it out.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is convinced now that the national defense authorities see the necessity for keeping a strong Marine Corps and also a strong Navy. I know the gentleman has fought for that over the years and has been very helpful.

Mr. VINSON. Well, I do not think it is exactly fair to say that the national defense, meaning the Pentagon hierarchy, was ever in favor of complete elimination of the Marine Corps; I do not think that is exactly correct. Perhaps someone thought that it was a little bit larger than the facts warranted, but to my way of thinking, when we finish with our present hearings on the state of our defenses, I am satisfied that we will be asking for more than the newspapers state is being asked for now as far as the Marine Corps is concerned. The newspapers stated yesterday that somebody said this and somebody said that about the proposed program, but regardless of that, I think the Marine Corps has to be strengthened considerably because it is a very effective fighting organization, and it must be strong both on the ground and in the air.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true of the Navy also.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, I know that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am very glad to hear what the gentleman said. It is encouraging because I have a very distinct and vivid recollection, and it is in the printed RECORD of the hearings on the unification bill, that General Eisenhower did recommend that the Marine Corps be reduced to a police force status.

Mr. VINSON. The Committee on Armed Services knows what the Marine Corps can do, and the Marine Corps will

always be in existence as long as we have the power to bring it before the House for its consideration.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think it would be helpful, perhaps, to the Members, if the able chairman would point out what our present authorized strength is in the Army and the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, and our present actual strength in those different categories.

Mr. VINSON. The legislative ceiling as far as the Army is concerned is 837,000 and the 1951 appropriated strength is 630,000. The statutory ceiling of the Navy, including the Marines, is 666,882 and the 1951 appropriated strength is 461,000. In the Air Force the authorized ceiling is 502,000 and the 1951 appropriated strength is 416,000.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy that the chairman has put those figures in the RECORD, because it clearly shows that we have not as yet come up by any means to our authorized strength.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, when the bill now under consideration was before the Armed Services Committee last Friday, I urged that action be postponed for a short time so that the Armed Services Committee, the Congress, and the people of this country might have some definite information as to where the country is going. The present manpower ceilings in the Defense Establishment are sufficient for today, tomorrow, and possibly for several months. My sole purpose in opposing the reporting of the bills and my only purpose in speaking today is to draw the attention of the American people to the fact that we may be embarking upon a course of action which will require manpower and resources beyond our capacity.

No matter what we may call the present engagement in which we are involved, the fact is that we are at war, and it should be noted at this point that neither the people of our country nor the Congress has participated in that decision. Technically, the defense of South Korea is a United Nations undertaking but actually the United States is the sole defender. If there should be other outbreaks, especially in the Far East, it is reasonable to assume that the United States alone will undertake to stop the enemy.

I assume that the Congress will approve the legislation which is before us but when it does, it should understand that it is placing in the hands of the President the power to call into the service as many men as he chooses and to send them to any part of the world that he decides we must defend. In other words, we are placing great additional power in the hands of those men who have been running our Defense Establishment and the executive branch of our Government since the termination of

the war and who are directly responsible for our confused foreign policy, but more important, it is the same group who are directly responsible for the almost complete lack of preparedness which we now find exists, despite the fact that since the termination of the war Congress has appropriated \$95,000,000,000 for the Defense Establishment.

The country was told not so long ago that the prospects for peace were brighter than they had ever been since the termination of the war; that we did not need a Navy of any account; that amphibious landings and tank warfare were outmoded. In other words, the judgment of the top leaders in this administration has been wrong. I have no desire to be unduly critical of them. I suspect that their hearts are heavy, but the fact still remains that their judgment was not good. And I say again that we are now preparing to place great additional power at an extremely critical moment in the same hands.

Yesterday the President submitted a request for additional funds to increase the strength of our Defense Establishment. In the light of what is happening in the world today and what may very well happen tomorrow, the sum of money requested is obviously insufficient. The fact is that it will not do much more than bring our Defense Establishment up to the efficiency that it would have had about 2 years ago if funds requested at that time had not been slashed in what was described by the heads of the Department of Defense as an economy measure.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the people of this country are entitled to know exactly where they are being led. They should be told just how we can carry on the defense of the world without completely wrecking our own economy and reducing ourselves to a totalitarian state.

It is interesting to note that although the present undertaking is technically the stand of the United Nations, America, and the American people alone, will pay the price, not only with our men but with our resources. The only aid which we have received up to this point comes in the form of laudatory resolutions approving what we are doing but not offering real assistance of any kind. I suspect that if there are other Koreans and we decide to defend them we will be alone in those undertakings.

Ten billion dollars is a drop in the bucket compared to what the actual cost will be, to say nothing of the loss of our young men.

If we in a laudable effort to assist other nations ruin America we will have done exactly what Mr. Stalin would like to see accomplished. There will then be very little hope for the future of the world.

From 1932 down to date whenever any emergency has arisen, either at home or abroad, the solution offered by the New Deal has been the acquisition of greater power and control and, of course, further expenditure of billions of dollars. These schemes have produced nothing up to now, except a weakening of America and involvements all over the world,

which, if allowed to continue, will certainly ruin the greatest Nation on earth.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have reached the point where the Congress must assert itself and before it yields further to Executive pressure for more power it should insist on knowing exactly where we are being taken. If the Congress and the people of this country want to travel a road that may very well lead to ruination, they should make the decision.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman on his excellent statement. I certainly agree with him.

Mr. TOWE. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the measure now pending is intended to permit a very substantial increase in the numerical strength of our Armed Forces, I think it is not irrelevant that I refer to the problem involved in increasing that strength. It is a very serious problem. There is nothing very dramatic about it, but it hits home.

Under existing law each of the three services has endeavored to build up a reserve on a voluntary system. For the moment I am not including the National Guard which I believe should be considered separately. Rather, I am referring to the Organized Reserves, so-called, of the Army, the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps and Air Force Reserve.

The figures given to the Committee on Armed Services and also to the Committee on Appropriations look rather good at first glance, but an examination into the actual situation does not bring much encouragement. Five hundred and twenty thousand men are now included in the Army Reserve. Only 250,000 of them are taking anything like what may be termed training. The rest are in what might be termed a pool, undergoing little or no training. The huge majority of the 520,000 are veterans of World War II. Their average age is approaching 28 years. Many of those men volunteered in the Reserves from the most patriotic motives as they were discharged from active duty at the conclusion of the war, but have undertaken heavy domestic burdens since then. Thousands and thousands of them have married and have children—dependents. Undoubtedly a few are not as strong physically as they were 5 or 6 years ago, due to some accident or illness. Of course, other elements may enter into the situation which, taken with the ones I have tried to describe, will greatly reduce that pool of 520,000 men. How much it will be reduced if called upon, no one knows. That pool will have to be relied upon, to a very large extent, in filling up the Regular Army to the figures contemplated, namely, 837,000. The pool cannot do it. The gap must be filled by men inducted under the draft, and they will come forward as raw recruits, or the gap may be

filled in part by new men who will volunteer. They, too, will be raw recruits. The Army is contemplating—and it is no secret—filling up 10 divisions. We have only about three divisions now, and they are not at war strength. To fill up seven more divisions, largely with raw recruits, will take months and months. Not until next spring can we expect to have a usable division made up in such fashion. Our reserves are not sufficient.

Now we look at the Navy. The Navy Reserve contains 1,103,000 men. Only 204,000 are on an active training basis. The rest constitute a huge pool. The Navy is in better shape than the Army with respect to reserves. Landsman that I am, I venture an explanation of that, if you will bear with me, because this is exceedingly important when you talk about increasing the Armed Forces of the United States. The Army Reserve is expected to be organized finally into tactical units—divisions, regiments, battalions, companies, platoons, and squads. The Navy Reserve, by contrast, is not expected to be organized into crews of ships. None of the personnel of the Naval Reserve, and very properly the Navy follows that course, is organized to man a ship completely from skipper down.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. There is one exception in the Navy, they do have units of aircraft and submarine.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; that is true. I am speaking of the general pool. The Navy also is in better condition than the Army because in the Naval Reserve—and I may not use the correct expressions—there is a great pool of men who are subject to special assignments, men who have already had experience in the last war. They can be placed on a ship and assigned in a particular station and instantly go to work with the crew.

The Air Force has a reserve of 354,000 men. Only 68,000 of them are on an active training basis. Those men do their best, in 23 Air Force stations scattered over the country, to get some training once a week in flying and in the care of planes. The rest of that 354,000 men get training confined almost entirely to correspondence and listening to lectures; that is all.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It occurs to me that many of these 68,000 men would perhaps be a little old for real active duty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The same observation applies to all three of these categories. They are all getting older. Now, we have relied up to this point, mistakenly I believe—and now I am going to utter some sentiments which may not arouse uproarious applause—we have relied upon the volunteer system to maintain the reserve, and it has failed. Make no mistake about it, it has failed. Our Reserve strength ought to be three or four times the strength of our first-line

forces. And it should be a well-trained Reserve.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think that is hardly fair, to say it has failed because it is on a volunteer basis, because there have been literally hundreds of thousands of veterans of the different branches of our armed services who had combat experience in the last war who have done their very best to get into Reserve training but have been unable to do so, and it has not been altogether due to the lack of funds. As far as the Air Force is concerned we gave them \$75,000,000 which they never did spend. This proves that it is not the fault of Congress or the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not mean to start the argument again as to where the blame lies.

Mr. SHORT. I want to get it very clear and unmistakable that the blame does not rest on the Congress. We have got to face the facts as they are.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am endeavoring to face the facts as they are and to look ahead.

Mr. SHORT. That is all right, and Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes—I want to give him all the time I have. The only way to improve is to recognize mistakes and to be honest and courageous enough to admit that they are mistakes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not dispute the good objective of this legislation; I support it enthusiastically. It is going to take 8 or 9 months to fill up these units. We have not a large enough reserve that is trained; we must resort to the draft to a considerable extent. From the draft we get raw recruits who must be trained.

I can remember some experiences in World War II with respect to the National Guard. I remember the Twenty-seventh National Guard Division which was mobilized along with all the other divisions. It lacked 3,000 men of being at war strength. When it was mobilized that division had to spend 6 months training those new 3,000 recruits. Had it been at war strength when it was called into service it could have taken the field. None of these divisions that we are now talking about can take the field short of 6, 8 or 9 months.

That does not disturb me so deeply with respect to Korea alone. What I am thinking about is the long pull. How are we going to be sure of getting an adequate reserve composed of trained citizens? I say again, and I have been saying this for 30 years, that it can be done only by universal military training. It cannot be done in any other way. Suppose that in 1947 we had passed the UMT bill—incidentally the gentleman from New Jersey was the sponsor of it—and suppose that it had gone into effect immediately or within a reasonable period thereafter. Here we are in 1950. We would have had in our trained reserve

by this time two complete classes, each having had 1 year of training and composed of 800,000 men each, available for service when a great military mobilization might come along, and completely adequate.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. What assurance would we have had that the President or the administration would not have cut back the funds or would not have permitted that training?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot tell, of course. I am trying to point out what I have believed for a great many years, that the only sound way for a democracy to preserve itself from a savage aggression is to rely upon trained citizens, trained in time of peace and subject to service only when war comes along, rather than to rely completely upon professional Regulars whom we cannot support in time of peace in large enough numbers and in sufficient strength to keep the country safe in war. We have got to face this thing some day. If this row in Korea expands into something much larger—God knows I hope it does not—we will be up against this question of reserves and we will find ourselves without them. You will simply have to call into the services through the draft raw recruits and thus for 6, 8, or 10 months break down the efficiency of your military units.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is it not true that Australia and other countries are contemplating rejecting voluntary enlistments, and going to the compulsory method, so that there will be an even distribution of service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not aware of what is going on in other countries. I am not in favor of rejecting volunteers. I am not in favor of rejecting men voluntarily enlisting in the Regular Army or National Guard or in the Reserves, but when you have not enough reserves and you have no means of knowing how many you will have a year from now or 2 years from now or 3 years from now, you have not the slightest idea where you are, which means you do not know where you are going.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we have heard the excellent and very apropos remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia in which he pointed out some of the military weaknesses and some of the things that may be necessary to remedy them. Subsequently we heard the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] in which he pointed out, I think very adequately, the possible reasons for our present military condition and pointed out with justification the responsibility for our present circumstances.

Subsequently during the debate on the bill, H. R. 9177, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH] very piously took the floor and stated that bygones should be bygones, that we should now forget the errors and mistakes of the past and go ahead from here on. He also complimented, and in that I join, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I say again that I join with him in that statement.

However, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH], not too long ago, was taking an opposite point of view concerning the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. You all are very familiar with the B-36 probe of last year. In October of 1949 the Committee on Armed Services held extensive hearings on procurement of the B-36 and related matters. Subsequently the committee filed a report, but during the hearings, if my recollection is correct, the gentleman from Indiana stomped out of the committee room and said he would not have one more thing to do with the investigation. If I am in error in regard to this, I would like to have the gentleman from Indiana correct me.

Mr. WALSH. At the completion of the gentleman's remarks I will ask for time to answer.

Mr. FORD. Very well. The Committee on Armed Services, following that investigation, in House Document 600, entitled "Unification and Strategy," summary of views and recommendations of the House Armed Services Committee, came to certain conclusions, 33 in number. All but No. 33 were approved unanimously. Eight of the members of the Committee on Armed Services objected to the approval of recommendation No. 33. Included in the minority was the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH].

For your information I will read what recommendation 33 included:

The removal of Admiral Denfeld was a reprisal against him for giving testimony to the House Armed Services Committee. This act is a blow against effective representative government in that it tends to intimidate witnesses and hence discourages the rendering of free and honest testimony to the Congress; it violated promises made to the witnesses by the committee, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Defense; and it violated the Unification Act, into which a provision was written specifically to prevent actions of this nature against the Nation's highest military and naval officers.

I say this, Members of the Committee, that I wholeheartedly approve of the action of the Committee on Armed Services under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia. I concur in his statement made today. I also wholeheartedly support the point of view of the gentleman from Missouri. We cannot forget bygones; we must analyze our present position by realizing what errors we have made in the past. We cannot progress in the future unless we know where we have failed heretofore. I do not intend to let statements get by on the floor of this House that gloss over and try to cover up actions of individuals and groups within our borders.

I would like to also make a statement regarding several other comments made by the gentleman from Indiana. He said that 70 percent of our appropriations for the last few years were for military expenses. That is not accurate. What he meant to say, and I am sure he will correct it in the RECORD, is that 70 percent of our appropriations are for past wars, including military appropriations for future wars, appropriations for veterans' benefits and other miscellaneous items. But, he definitely said they were for military expenses and such a statement was inaccurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, my remarks must have been misunderstood by a few here in the House today. My remarks, following those of my distinguished friend from Missouri, were meant as an appeal for understanding and cooperation. Perhaps I was not as restrained as I should be because I disagreed somewhat with his remarks.

It is very apparent that we should get some of these things out of our system, and apparently we are doing so today. I agree with the distinguished gentleman that preceded me that my remarks should be that 70 percent of our budget is going for wars past and present and in preparation for possible future conflicts. I have at times disagreed with my distinguished chairman [Mr. VINSON]. Anyone that sits in the Committee on Armed Services recognizes his worth and his leadership. But sometimes Mr. VINSON, if he will pardon me, is not the most patient individual. He has a tendency toward running the committee in a style that is not inimitable.

As a freshman member of the Committee on Armed Services I became disturbed in the hearings on the B-36 investigation. As I felt that the younger members were not being given a chance to participate in the same, and I walked out in a huff. I saw a newspaperman friend of mine, and he asked me what had occurred. I thought I was talking largely off the record, but much to my sorrow the next day the headlines said that I accused the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] of being a Navy stooge. I later corrected this, because I had not used those words. However, the newspaperman apparently had, and I had acquiesced. I have often been sorry for those remarks. I recognize the worth of the gentleman from Georgia, but I still say that the manner in which the investigation was being held at that time did not please me. I did feel that we in the backfield, the younger members, were not given the opportunity to express ourselves fully. However, I have noticed since then that our chairman has been most considerate of the younger members of the committee. I am positive that he does not hold that against me, and I certainly do not against him, because I think the gentleman from Georgia knows more about the military needs of this country than any other man in the Nation.

I want to say something about the B-36 investigation. I signed the minority report. I am proud of that fact, and I would have signed it again. I am a lawyer. I told the House yesterday that I had practiced law for 16 years. I do not believe in hearsay evidence. I believe any man accused should be allowed to face his accuser. I think it is an outrage when any man in this body, or the other one, who has congressional immunity accuses a person of something and the individual that is accused, even though he is later vindicated, has no right of redress.

I attended practically every one of the hearings in the B-36 investigation. They were concluded only a few days after my outburst. I want to say that Secretary Matthews was unjustly accused, as was Secretary Johnson, and largely upon hearsay evidence. I felt then that the criticism leveled at Secretary Matthews was unjust, that we had heard only one side of the issue. I agree with my good friend from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT] when he says that good resulted from the B-36 investigation. But I am making no apology for the B-36 bomber. It is the greatest plane now in existence, and our investigation proved this fact. I heard the late General Arnold tell us what it could do.

Mr. Chairman, where would we be today without the atomic bomb. Where would we be? Russia would be at our doorstep. The atomic bomb is a deterrent against all-out Soviet aggression. Who is going to carry the atomic bomb in case of a world conflict? Today there is only one airplane, in my opinion, that can carry it to Europe and return, and that is not giving any secrets away. It is the B-36 bomber.

Unjustly and unfairly the B-36 bomber was attacked in our committee. It was attacked upon the floor of the House and in the newspapers. After the investigation was concluded we all unanimously agreed that the charges against the B-36 and its acquisition were absolutely false. I do not feel that Admiral Denfeld was unjustly treated, and I am still standing by that statement. I can still say to you today that I am standing behind the minority report. We only disagreed in this report in one item. Seven members of the committee voted the same as I did, but on the other 29 or 30 items, I have forgotten how many there were, we were unanimous in our report. Of course, a committee of this size and importance disagrees. We disagree here today violently in our feelings. But I think if there is one thing we can do is to get it out of our systems and we can fight here on the floor of the House, but tomorrow and henceforth we will go forward fighting together to win this war. I could point out to this Member and other Members their voting records in the past. I could, if necessary, point out where he failed to vote for what I consider to be the best interest of the defense of our country. I know that I, too, have cast bad votes, but what I am saying now and wanted to point out in my earlier remarks, is that these things do not matter now.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Tell me where.

Mr. WALSH. I said I am not going to do it.

Mr. FORD. Well, I am asking you to.

Mr. WALSH. I will produce the record here tomorrow, if you want it brought forth.

Mr. FORD. I certainly do.

Mr. WALSH. You are the one who brought this argument up—not me. I do not care to indulge in personalities.

Mr. FORD. But you certainly did.

Mr. WALSH. After all, my good friend, you are the one who took the floor first. I did not know you from Adam. I will have your record tomorrow and show it in the RECORD if you wish.

Mr. FORD. You can come to my office and I will give it to you to save time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

I do not care to get in any discussion. The point I am trying to make is that tempers are flaring here today. I hope when it is all said and done we can forget the votes we have cast in the past and the mistakes that we have made—and we have made plenty of them, all of us—and go out of this Chamber united, because we are certainly in a world conflict which we may never see the end.

As the father of four children, and I am proud of it, I am going to do my level best to see to it that those children have the opportunity to live in a free world, free of communism. I hope my vote in the future, as I hope it has been in the past, will never be cast along political lines, especially at this time when the fate of the world rests to a great extent upon us, the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I cannot add much more information on these two measures, but tempers seem to be flaring here this afternoon. After all, you know it is very pleasing to me to see the difference in the debate today and the unanimous cooperation in a matter which probably means the life or death of our Nation in the years to come. There is a big difference between now and 1939, 1940, and 1941, when we were voting on measures far into the night. Roll call after roll call occurred at that period and this body at that time was seriously divided. Not so today. These measures, which are very far-reaching, are going to pass unanimously.

It has also been pointed out to you the difficulties under which we are operating today. I do not believe it is any time to point out the faults or mistakes that may have occurred in the past. I think it is best for us at the present time, in this hour, to confine ourselves to the job ahead and not forget about the situation and the predicament and obligations that this Nation has taken upon itself.

We have listened, and I particularly have listened, for the last year to the intelligence reports around the world. We, of course, have had a policy of confinement against communism, and they

have a policy of expansion. So I think anyone could come to the conclusion that this beginning which has happened in Korea is only the beginning. I think we can expect Russia to do everything she can to divide us and our allies. That is very evident. They are master minds at propaganda. They have already convinced the world of that. I do not know how many more measures will come before this House during the next few weeks. I hope and know that this House will pass every measure that is necessary. I am satisfied that the things we do on the floor of this House and the things we say here are broadcast every night in Moscow. We cannot hear it, but I am convinced of that. Of course, I am not qualified to lecture the press. Neither am I qualified to lecture this body. There are men here who have had much more experience than I have had, like the chairman of our committee. Certainly he is qualified to speak, and he has spoken today for the national defense of this country. I never heard more comprehensive over-all statement with reference to our national defense than he made today. I have tried, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to study the problems at all times and to do what I could as an individual to help and assist my country to be prepared in case of danger. We all realize today that probably the bargain-counter days of Democracy are over, and we are going to have to pay for it from now on, because the fact is that God grants liberty only to those who love it and are willing and able to guard and defend it at all times. We have a great country. Let us be Americans first and forget about our little differences.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in his July 19 message to Congress, President Truman asserted the Nation's economic resources will require substantial redirection, but up to this time his National Security Resources Board has not seen fit to consult with America's farmers, the producers of the all-essential food and fiber.

The Security and Resources Board has consulted with industry and labor, and granted a committee, representing much of labor, at least semiofficial advisory recognition. That is commendable as far as it goes but it certainly does not go far enough.

I insist that American farmers, who produce each year 65 percent of the Nation's new wealth and who must be depended upon to feed the Nation, its military forces, and perhaps part of the world, be given an equal voice with any and all other segments of the economy in war-planning procedures.

The brush-off they have received from the war planners in Washington is unthinkable.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have only one more request for time on this side. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate these few minutes to discuss the problem facing us at this moment. I hope this bill passes without any objection, and I hope that our defense officials immediately get busy to build a Navy, an Air Force, and an Army as quickly as we make the funds available for them, because we have a long road ahead. I know that these recruits we are taking in now will have to have basic training for approximately 17 weeks. Then they will be only ready to start their team training. The armed services have got to develop fighting teams before they commit these young men to the battle line. I cannot conceive of the Notre Dame football teams mobilizing today a group of high school rookies, and putting them out against the all-stars tomorrow morning, nor can I further conceive of the Reserves, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] mentioned, who have been inactive the past 4 years being used immediately. Certainly you would not expect the Notre Dame football team to collect its varsity members of 4 years ago and put them on the firing line tomorrow without running signals in a thorough practice and conditioning program. I do not think we should gamble with the lives of our untrained or unseasoned boys. We must profit from the lessons of World War II; we must train these boys, and the sooner we get started the better.

As I have stated here on other occasions, it was my privilege and opportunity to teach military history and military policy some 30 years ago, in one of the State universities. You will remember on July 18 in the debate on the extension of Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, I mentioned the statement of de Toqueville in 1835, of Lord Palmerson in 1853, and of Commodore Perry in 1856 regarding the role of Russia in the family of nations. What we must realize is that this is not a temporary passing situation that we are facing here. I think many of us fail to realize what we are up against. We are at the place now where we must maintain our Nation's position in this world or we are going to face defeat and humiliation, and we cannot win by committing untrained, unskilled teams—not teams, but groups of boys—to combat prematurely. What we must do is to train adequately the young men of our country for the ground forces, the air forces, and the Navy. We have got to make this decision quickly if we are to give these boys basic training of 15 to 17 weeks, then adequate team training, before we put them into combat units on the firing line.

I listened with great interest a few minutes ago to the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] regarding the matter of universal military training. While I was

still on active duty in the Regular Army in 1919, I recall my following the outstanding work of Senator WADSWORTH, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, when he tried to secure a universal military training program. The proposed training at that time was for 3 months with an additional 1 month of training optional. That length of training was then considered adequate for basic training only. I recall also working with the American Legion leaders of my State for a military-training program, for some 20 years starting with my assignment to the University of Iowa in 1921 as assistant professor of military science and tactics and continuing up to our entry into World War II. While I have always opposed compulsory military service in peacetime, I have just as vigorously supported universal military training as a permanent policy in order to prepare our young men better to defend themselves and their Nation whenever we might suddenly become involved in war.

If our young men today who were too young to take part in World War II all had basic military training our armed services could now save 3 months of necessary delay in placing them in fighting teams for field training, whereas all of our untrained young men must now be given that basic training before we should even think of placing them in combat teams for field maneuvers preceding their commitment to combat.

Another thing I must mention is that the gentleman from North Carolina and I have been fighting shoulder to shoulder for many years to build up stockpiles of strategic and critical materials. I am very pleased to read the headlines in the papers today saying that the President now states that we must take immediate steps to build up adequate stockpiles of strategic and critical materials. That is something that is absolutely essential, for we cannot fight wars with our airplanes and our new weapons still on the drawing boards and in blueprints. We had better speed up this stockpile program just as fast as we can.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, in 1945 the United States Air Force had 273 groups and was the most powerful in the world. In 1946 it was reduced to 38 groups.

The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, early in 1948 realized that the Nation's Air Force strength was deteriorating to a point where the security of the country was in danger and took action on April 1, 1948, to establish as a peacetime minimum a 70-group air force.

In the light of current events it is plainly evident that the House Committee on Armed Services was way ahead of both the executive department and the Department of National Defense in planning for the air defense of this Nation in time of emergency.

We all recall the efforts of Hon. W. Stuart Symington, former Secretary of

Air and Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, to convince the President of the United States and the Secretary of National Defense that the defense of our Nation required a 70-group air force.

The real story of the 70-group air force is as follows:

STORY OF THE 70-GROUP PROGRAM

First, Pre-VJ-day background: by the end of World War II the Air Force was working toward a goal of a balanced peacetime establishment capable of (a) meeting the requirements of national security; (b) providing a proper mobilization potential in the form of a sound and adequate aircraft industry; (c) providing a sound and adequate trained reserve potential; (d) providing a sound and adequate physical plant capable of supporting the above elements.

The core of the above establishment was to be composed of 70 first-line groups which gave their name to the entire program, commonly known as the 70-group program.

The 70-group program goal had been set while the war was still in progress. It was planned to reach it through an orderly reduction from the peak strength of 273 groups reached by the Army Air Forces in World War II.

Second, Dissolution of Air Force air strength: Immediately after VJ-day the entire Military Establishment virtually disbanded—"disintegrated", in the words of General Marshall, instead of demobilizing. By June 30, 1947, the Air Force had sunk to a level of 38 groups—the "paper strength" being higher but the additional units being neither fully manned nor equipped. At that point, the downward trend was halted and the Air Force gradually began to rebuild its strength.

Third, Rebuilding of Air Force air strength: From the 38-group level of June 30, 1947, the initial objective of the Air Force was to reach a level of 55 groups by December 31, 1947. These groups were to be fully manned and to have at least a minimum of training, though equipped largely with World War II aircraft. Six months later—that is, by June 30, 1948—these 55 groups were to be in full operational status. The next interim step toward the 70-group goal was established as a strength of 66 groups by June 30, 1949. The remaining four groups were to be activated during fiscal year 1950.

Fourth, Executive branch and congressional committee endorsement of 70 groups: On December 20, 1947, the President's Air Policy Commission, headed by Mr. Finletter, reported officially that "the country must have a new strategic concept for its defense and the core of this concept is air power," and that "the minimum force necessary at the present time is an Air Force organized into 70 combat groups, and 22 special squadrons, supplemented by 27 National Guard groups and 34 groups of Air Reserve."

This Commission's studies and report were followed by the report, on March 1, 1948, of the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board which found a 70 combat air group Air Force to be imperative for the Nation to "mount promptly an

effective, continuing, and successful air offensive against a major enemy." Both of these reports were important factors in substantiating Air Force policy. Both reports recommended prompt action to re-create the strength of the Air Force through an orderly expansion toward the 70-group goal as the minimum needed to assure national security in time of peace.

Fifth, First congressional actions to require a 70-group program: On April 1, 1948, before the House Armed Services Committee meeting in executive session, Hon. CARL VINSON moved that the committee go on record in favor of the 70-group program recommended by the Air Force. The motion was taken under advisement by subcommittee No. 5 of the committee, chairmanned by Hon. Charles Clason, with direction to report back to the full committee on April 7, 1948.

On April 8, 1948, the chairman of subcommittee No. 5 reported to the full committee that the subcommittee had unanimously approved a resolution proposed by Hon. CARL VINSON regarding the current status of appropriations for the Air Force. This resolution concluded with the following:

Resolved, That it is hereby expressed as the sense of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that this Nation should have an Air Force with a minimum strength of 70 combat groups, supplemented by the necessary special squadrons, air National Guard and air Reserve groups, which would require the expenditure of \$5,442,000,000 during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and since the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget contains a request for approximately \$3,054,000,000: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of this committee that an additional budget request of \$2,338,000,000 for the United States Air Force should be promptly submitted to the Congress.

The above resolution was adopted by a hand vote of 22 of the 23 members present. Copies were transmitted to the President, Secretary of Defense, Speaker of the House, and the Secretary of Defense was asked to express his own views on the subject at a later time before the committee.

On April 14, 1948, Hon. Charles Clason introduced a bill, H. R. 6247, establishing the composition of the Air Force. That bill authorized a peacetime Air Force of 70 Regular Air Force groups, 22 separate Regular Air Force squadrons, supplemented by such reserve forces, including 27 Air National Guard and 34 Air Force Reserve groups, as might be required. On the following day, April 15, 1948, the House approved, by a vote of 343 to 3, the Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948, which contained \$1,687,000,000 for Air Force procurement of aircraft, a sum \$822,000,000 more than requested by the administration. This additional sum was termed the first year's program of a 5-year undertaking having the objective of a 70-group program for the Air Force.

On June 3, 1948, the bill H. R. 6247, cited above, was reported unanimously by the House Armed Services Committee to the House of Representatives. On

June 11, 1948, the bill passed the House without dissenting vote.

Sixth, Executive branch resistance to 70-group program: By the end of June, 1948, the Air Force had reached a level of 59 activated groups en route to the 70-group goal. In June 25, 1948, however, the President placed specific limitations on the Services to the effect that budget ceilings for fiscal year 1950 would have to be well under the amount necessary to carry out previously planned programs. It was determined that the budget ceiling forecast for the Air Force would support no more than 48 groups. At this point, then, the problem within the Air Force became one of cancellation of many of the procurement, stations, manpower, recruiting, and training programs which had been established.

The situation would have been clear at this point had it not been for indications in the Congress that it did not firmly support this military retrenchment as it applied against the Air Force. On January 13, 1948, Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, introduced a bill, H. R. 1437, authorizing the composition of the Army and Air Force. This bill again placed before the Congress the 70-group program, for it specifically authorized the program as the peacetime goal of the United States Air Force. On February 8, 1949, by a vote of 29 to 0, the House Armed Services Committee unanimously reported H. R. 1437 to the House of Representatives. Also on February 8, 1949, the House Committee on Armed Services officially endorsed, without dissenting vote, the appearance of Chairman VINSON before the House Committee on Appropriations to request an increase in the Air Force 1950 budget in the amount of \$800,000,000. These moves made clearly apparent the unanimous support of the House Armed Services Committee for the 70-group program, both in funds and in legislative authorization.

The position of the entire House of Representatives was made eminently clear on Air Force air power later in March, 1949. On March 22, by a vote of 395 to 4, the House passed H. R. 1437, the so-called 70-group bill. On March 28, 1949, Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee presented his recommendations, on behalf of the Armed Services Committee, to the Armed Forces Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in respect to the 1950 military budget. Those recommendations, endorsed by the Armed Services Committee, included the recommendation that the Air Force budget be increased in the amount of \$800,000,000 in order to increase the Air Force from 48 groups—established by the executive branch—to 58 groups, thereby urging the Congress to continue its efforts eventually to reach the 70-group program goal. On April 9, 1949, the Appropriations Committee favorably reported to the House H. R. 4146 which contained \$851,000,000 for the Air Force over and above the budget recommendations. This sum was intended to maintain an Air Force strength of 58 groups instead of 48 groups, and was considered

to be the second year increment of the 70-group program. On April 13, 1949, H. R. 4146 passed the House, after a vote of 271 to 1 had defeated a motion to recommit the bill. The bill was approved by the President on October 29, 1949.

On October 29, in signing the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950 (H. R. 4146) the President issued a statement indicating objections to the action of the Congress in increasing funds for the Air Force and directing the Secretary of Defense to place in reserve the amounts provided by the Congress in H. R. 4146 for increasing the structure of the Air Force. The amount placed in reserve by the President was \$735,754,000.

As the year 1949 came to a close, therefore, the Congress was in the position of having insisted upon a 58-group program as the second-year increment of the 70-group program, whereas the President insisted upon maintaining a strength of 48 groups.

Seventh. The 70-group program in the second session, Eighty-first Congress: By virtue of the President's action of October 29, 1949, the 70-group issue remained quiescent during the early part of 1950. On April 4, 1950, however, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, in an address to the House of Representatives, called for an increase in the 1951 military budget in the amount of \$583,289,221—\$200,000,000 more for the Air Force—to maintain 48 groups—and \$383,289,221 for the Navy for aircraft procurement. This effort subsequently produced an increase of \$350,000,000 in the 1951 military budget passed by the House of Representatives—\$200,000,000 additional for the Air Force and \$150,000,000 for the Navy.

However, on June 30, 1950, the House of Representatives approved a conference report on H. R. 1437 which established in law the 70-group program, thereby again insisting upon this program over the opposition of the executive branch which had succeeded in obtaining the elimination of this expression in the law in the Senate.

On July 11, 1950, the President approved H. R. 1437. The 70-group program, as a peacetime ceiling on the Air Force, has therefore been enacted into law. As of July 12, 1950, however, the appropriated strength of the Air Force remains at the level demanded by the President—48 groups.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, having just voted for S. 3937 it is my purpose to vote for H. R. 9178. The fact is, when given the opportunity, I intend to vote for every measure that will accelerate our program for national defense and security. This does not mean that I have just been converted to the necessity of drastic action in order to protect our free democratic way of life.

The record will show that I have consistently urged adequate national defense. On February 24 1949; on March 16, 1949; and, on October 10, 1949, I spoke from the well of the House stressing the importance of being prepared

for any emergency. And, in the interim, I have pointed out the need for greater national defense.

Along with the majority of the Members of this body, I have advocated the establishment of a 70-group air force as will be seen from the following excerpt of one of my speeches:

During the past 2 years a great deal has been said about an adequate national defense. When the flush of victory had receded after the last war we discovered that the possibility of still another war was not nearly so remote as we had assumed. Furthermore, we discovered that our national defense program had sadly lagged, and that, in the words of the wartime commander of the Air Forces, this country's Air Force had become a one-punch outfit. All leading authorities of military concepts agree that air power is essential either for an adequate defensive or an offensive force. The time when this country could feel secure against a sudden attack because of our geographical location is gone forever. The science of aeronautics has brought the nations of the world so close together that none may feel secure against attack. It is obvious, therefore, that we must maintain an adequate Air Force. All who are interested in the welfare of the United States concur on that point. The question is not whether we should maintain a strong Air Force—everyone agrees to that. The question is what size Air Force we should maintain in order to have an adequate national defense. I am in favor of a force composed of 70 groups.

It is not by accident or at random that I have chosen that figure. I am not a military man, but civilians, as well as the military, can, in times of peace, examine the available data and draw conclusions. During an emergency we must rely upon our military forces and accept their decisions. When speed of action is a requisite civilians must place their trust in their professional servicemen and aid them in every possible way to accomplish the results that are necessary for the security of all. In peacetime the situation is different. We are prone to look distrustfully at the requests of the military men, and we generally feel that they are asking for more than they expect when we examine their demands for appropriations. Such accusations cannot be made against disinterested civilians who study a situation and then make recommendations. Within the past 18 months two civilian groups have thoroughly examined the national defense picture and made recommendations concerning an adequate Air Force. These two groups were the President's Air Policy Commission and our own Congressional Aviation Policy Board. It is significant that both recommended the same number of planes that our military men deem essential—70 groups.

If it were not for the cost, there would be little opposition to the 70-group program. Our expenditures for national defense must, of course, be kept within the country's ability to pay for them. I believe our economy can easily stand the 70 groups. Even if supporting an air force this size should prove quite expensive, it seems to me that we have no alternative. The element of time which has been on our side in previous conflicts is not likely to be with us again.

If it should prove necessary to build our defenses from the bottom up after a war started, the task might be impossible. In addition the nucleus of a powerful air force should be a strong deterrent to any nation considering an attack upon this country.

Maintaining a force of 70 groups will be more expensive than a smaller force, but in the long run it may prove much cheaper. The cost of a war will be far greater than the comparatively low cost of keeping an adequate air force in time of peace. There

is no denying that an aggressor nation might not risk an attack if the possibilities of losing the ensuing conflict are strong.

There seems to be a great misconception in the minds of some as to the purpose of those who advocate an air force of 70 groups. Certainly building a force of this size cannot be construed as a preparation for war. It would take a far greater number of planes to win a war. The advocates of 70 groups feel that a force this size would be sufficient to hold any enemy until we could fully arm and take the offensive. A force this size is merely a defensive arrangement.

Building an adequate air force is not a matter of days, weeks, or months. It is a matter of years. Over a year ago the President's Air Policy Commission made their recommendations. Comparatively little has been done since that time. The Air Force now has only about 50 groups. Approval of the 70-group program does not mean that we will have 70 groups by next year or even the next. As Secretary of Defense Forrestal summed up the situation, this program merely places a ceiling upon the size of the Air Force, with the yearly appropriations determining the actual strength. It is essential that we get this program approved and underway. There are numerous factors and problems involved in building up our air power. The new technology has greatly intensified the engineering and research problems of the aircraft industry upon which the Air Force is dependent for its planes. A strong and healthy industry is indispensable to our national security. If the plane manufacturers are not able to turn out the needed planes for the Air Force upon short notice, we might well lose a war before getting started. Getting this program of expansion underway will be a breath of life to the aircraft industry, which has not been healthy since the end of the war. In terms of airframe weight the industry has produced less than half what it turned out during the war and has at times fallen to about one-fourth the amount produced during the war years. This is an alarming situation in that these low-production figures made it difficult to keep adequately trained personnel on hand, and in the event of a national emergency the plants would be slow in producing their quota of planes. We must assume that if we are attacked the enemy will be well prepared, and a delay in our production anywhere along the line could be disastrous. These facts demonstrate that the expansion of the Air Force to 70 groups will also bolster our defenses from another angle, since the expansion will aid the ailing aircraft industry.

In supporting the 70-group program, let me state that I do not consider this step a panacea for all of our military problems. Everyone must realize that there is no absolute defense against an enemy equipped with modern weapons. All that is possible for any nation to do in these dangerous times is to be so well prepared as to discourage any possible aggressor. The threat of a strong retaliatory force is more eloquent than words.

It is a striking paradox that peace may be achieved by air power, that implement which has become the greatest force for destruction in the history of the world. While a strong Air Force cannot give us absolute security, it does provide relative security from two directions. The first I have just mentioned. This relative security is provided by the fact that any nation would hesitate to attack us if we are well armed. The second state of relative security which an adequate air strength provides is the ability to smash any attack which might come. National security demands that we equip and maintain an adequate force. This is not preparation for war. It is preparation for the possibility of war, and between those two goals lies a

world of difference. After the last war wishful thinking on the part of many people in this country caused us to disarm at an alarming rate. No one wished war, and we even refused to accept the possibility. We placed our hopes for peace in the newly created United Nations and let our military affairs lag. Today the error of that policy is very much in evidence. Another powerful nation chose to place its trust in its military strength rather than in the United Nations. Now our country is in the position of having to rearm or face disaster. We do not have to face disaster. Our resources and wealth are such that we can build up adequate defenses without seriously upsetting the economy. While we are building up our air power, we must continue our efforts for peace through the United Nations. The fact that we expected too much from such a young organization must not be allowed to hamper its future possibilities. We are striving for peace, and, while we must now place our faith in a strong air defense, perhaps our children or grandchildren can place theirs in a strong United Nations rather than in their military potential.

Less than a year ago the Congressional Aviation Policy Board completed an extensive survey of this country's air-defense needs and reached many of the same conclusions that the President's commission had reached. To any civilian interested in military affairs this is highly important. The interservice squabbles over what we need for defense have often put Congress in the awkward position of determining who is right and what is best for the country regarding strictly military affairs. We face no such dilemma in the matter of an expanded Air Force. The recommendations of both the Board and the Commission were explicit as to the minimum needs. Both emphasized that weakness and uncertain national security are greater risks than the cost of this program. Both reports were made after months of exhaustive study. Both were made by groups who were interested in nothing but the security of our country. In the light of these facts it is necessary that we give sober consideration to their findings and recommendations. The Board's statement that "Anything less than complete supremacy in the air is self-deception" is especially significant. It is emphasis of the fact that an inadequate Air Force is not far from being as bad as no Air Force at all.

It was in recognition of the importance of air power that the Air Force was created as an autonomous military service by the National Security Act of 1947. Quite recently the Chief of Staff of that service listed the tasks of the Air Force in a given military situation. These tasks include the delivery of an immediate and powerful offensive against the basic sources of the enemy's war-making capacity; the defense of United States bases against air attack; and the tactical support of the Army and Navy in exploitation of the opportunities presented through the success of the first two tasks. Our present air strength would not allow the Air Force to accomplish these objectives. It must be placed in a condition of readiness to handle any situation which might arise. Where our national security is involved we are not at liberty to gamble, and anything less than an expansion toward 70 groups seems like a gamble.

The President's Air Policy Commission divided the threat of an attack against this country into two phases. We are in the first phase now. This phase represents the condition of world affairs. If war comes, it will be by accident not by design, since the enemy is not fully prepared. The Commission assumed the enemy would be fully prepared by January 1, 1953. In other words the enemy can be expected to have the

atomic bomb also, and phase two will begin. During this phase we can expect a deliberate and unprovoked attack. It is well to remember that during World War II most of the initial attacks were sudden and unexpected. The beginnings of any new war will undoubtedly follow the same pattern, and it is not at all unlikely that our country will be the target this time. The date at which one phase will merge into another is nothing but an intelligent guess. Although it seems unlikely, this year could conceivably be the beginning of phase two. We suspect that the enemy is not yet fully prepared; we know that we are not.

Our military men and two separate civilian groups have informed us of the size and type of Air Force that is essential for national security. The size is a force of 70 groups. We must take immediate steps and plan to reach that goal within the next 4 years. Our present force is inadequate. The national security is at stake, and we have no alternative but to remedy the situation by expansion of the Air Force. To say that any other course would be disastrous is highly arbitrary, since no one knows for certain that war will come. To say that any other course would be inviting disaster expresses the situation clearly and accurately. It is within our power to reject this invitation. We must not fail to do so.

In view of the trend of affairs in Korea, I believe it is imperative that the President declare a state of national emergency without delay; and, therefore, call upon him for such action now.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including section 2 (a) of the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and section 2, title I, of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 605), as amended, and sections 102 and 202 of the act of July 10, 1950 (Public Law 604, 81st Cong.), are hereby suspended until July 9, 1951.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the figure "2", strike out "(a)."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "suspended", insert a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of the RECORD to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to the reason why the time limitation originally contained in the bill was stricken out.

Mr. VINSON. I may say to my colleague from New York that the draft act expires on July 9, 1951. At that time the entire subject will be again reviewed.

Mr. COLE of New York. My purpose in raising the question was to indicate to the members of the committee that this is not a permanent lifting of the ceiling on the size of our Military Establishment.

Actually, the whole problem will be re-evaluated in July 1951, when the Draft Act expires.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from New York is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTEN, 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. 9178) to suspend the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to suspend restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the two bills just considered and passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL CRISIS IN KOREA

Mr. BATTLE. 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. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the international crisis in Korea emphasizes the fact that the action of people in other nations directly affects our daily lives. And almost every move we make has a terrific impact upon the peoples of foreign nations. Our relations determine whether or not we have war, which is one of the greatest factors in our everyday living. The lives that are being sacrificed in Korea at the present time give

testimony to our shortcomings in this respect.

It is estimated that 71 percent of our budget goes to pay for past wars and the prevention of future wars. Our relations with foreign countries largely determine our standard of living, the amount of taxes we will have to pay, how much money we can spend on domestic programs and how much money must be spent for military defense. So our foreign affairs and domestic affairs have become interwoven to such an extent that intelligent decisions can only be made by consideration of them both at the same time as two parts of one over-all national policy.

The constitution gives the chief responsibility for our foreign affairs to the President. Through necessity the Congress of the United States is being brought more into the international picture every day. With the grave responsibilities and far-reaching influence of our world leadership, the foreign aspects of our national policy can no longer be merely an executive function. The base on which the foreign portion of our policy is formulated and interpreted should be broadened. The responsibility of shaping the course of democracy in the free world we are striving for is too grave a burden for the Executive alone. Indeed, it is a problem too great for the executive and legislative branches combined, or for government officials alone. The foreign phase of our national policy must be built on a broader base which will not only bring trained minds with varying backgrounds into use, but will produce a medium through which the public and Congress will feel a direct participation in the formulation of policies which affect them so directly and which they are later called upon to support. This broadening of responsibility would provide a means of reassuring the public and Congress and establishing added confidence in the foreign side of our national policy.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I introduce a bill calling for the creation of a Foreign Affairs Advisory Commission to advise and consult with the President and thereby broaden the base on which our policy is formed.

This Commission would be composed of 12 members, broadly representative of the public and well informed in national and international affairs, including representatives of the Congress and the executive. They should be chosen on a nonpartisan basis and will serve only in an advisory capacity in order to conform with the provisions of our constitution. I invite your attention and consideration of this legislation.

TEXAS CITY TIN SMELTER OPERATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 714 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read 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. 8569) to strengthen the common defense by extending for 5 years the authority for the Texas City tin smelter operation.

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 Banking and Currency, 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. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 8569, which would extend the Texas City tin smelter operation for an additional 5 years. This legislation comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is made necessary by virtue of the shortage of tin production in this country. This operation was necessitated originally during World War II, and this bill would merely continue that operation, and comes at a most appropriate time since the Committee on Banking and Currency saw fit to institute the continuation of this operation prior to the Korean incident.

I am sure that there will be no extended debate on or opposition to either the resolution or the bill because I think we might just as well realize that we are going to have to do many of these things that we would much prefer not to do, and we will have to foster many enterprises that we would prefer to leave to private industry were it not for the world situation being what it is today.

That is all I have to say at present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition that I know of to the adoption of this rule. As the gentleman explained, it does provide consideration of the bill to continue for 5 years the operation or the authority for the operation of the Texas City tin smelter. That operation would come to an end in 1951 unless this legislation is enacted and, of course, there must be adequate advance notice given if the operation is to continue after next year. The continuation of this operation is reported to be of vital importance to our defense effort. It is the largest tin smelting plant, and one of the very few, we have in America.

I believe it is of interest to note that prior to World War II there were no tin smelting plants anywhere in the United States; in fact, prior to World War II we were not permitted to refine tin here in America, and were not even permitted the privilege of hauling tin in our own American vessels. The tin we obtained had to be first refined and then purchased from Great Britain or The Netherlands. Under the pressure of World War II the great smelter at Texas City was set up with the aid of our Federal Government, and certainly, because of the importance of tin to our national economy and in our defense effort we

should continue this plant operation for at least five more years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule will be adopted. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. 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. 8569) to strengthen the common defense by extending for 5 years the authority for the Texas City tin smelter operation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8569, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would continue the operation of the Texas City tin smelter for 5 years from June 30, 1951. The Texas City tin smelter, as has been said, is the only tin smelter of any substantial capacity in the Western Hemisphere. Tin is a critical material at this time. Since we reported this bill there has been a material advance in the price of tin. The capacity of the Texas City smelter is 36,000 tons a year. The consumption of the United States is about 65,000 tons a year.

It is essential to continue the operation of this smelter for 5 years in order that contracts may be made for the future delivery of the product and in order that the personnel may be retained, because if they find other employment men do not serve corporations they think will soon cease to exist. It is absolutely essential, if we desire to continue the operations of this plant, to pass this bill. It is absolutely essential to pass it in order that we may have an adequate supply of tin, which is so essential to our war effort and for the preservation of our food.

This is a Government-owned project. No private enterprise would go into a precarious business like this. The Government had to finance this smelter in order to be assured of the product. It was built primarily to handle the low-grade Bolivian ores, so that in time of war the refined product would not have to be transported to us through the sea lanes with all the perils of that transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is no objection to the bill. I do not intend to take the time of the House further on this subject.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the presentation of this bill at this time is probably one of many examples that may be presented to us in the future of

trying to pass legislation at a time of hysteria.

I hate to disagree with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency as to the amount of tin used in this country, but the Departments of Commerce and Interior have published certain figures which do not bear out his statements.

According to data published by the Departments of Commerce and Interior in May and June of this year, we now have in this country over 170,000 long tons of tin, more than the equivalent of a 3-year supply of pig tin now within our borders. The Texas City tin smelter, when originally constructed in 1941, was constructed with the understanding that they had a system by which they could produce high-grade tin from low-grade Bolivian ores.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I did not make any statement which the gentleman does not corroborate by his statement. I said that the consumption of tin in the United States was about 65,000 tons a year. Now the gentleman is talking about the stockpile. I made no statement with regard to that.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. Further, may I say for the information of the gentleman from Kentucky that the same data published by the Departments of Commerce and Interior shows the average consumption from 1942 to 1949 in the United States was 55,000 tons of pig tin a year. Last year we only consumed 50,273 tons of pig tin, and the average consumption even during the war years was only 55,806 tons.

At the time this Texas City tin smelter was erected in 1941 it was done with the distinct understanding that the Billiton Co., which is a Dutch corporation, had a system by which they could produce high-grade tin from low-grade Bolivian ores exclusively.

According to the information at the hearings which were held there has never been produced at the Texas City tin smelter any high-grade tin using solely low-grade Bolivian ore. Every time they have produced any pig tin it has been necessary for them to use a mixture of high-grade alluvial concentrates from the Far East or Africa.

Fortunately in the United States substantial quantities of such high-grade concentrates have been available for use since this smelter began its operations in 1942. It appears highly probable that during a future world war, if not sooner, the flow of tin metal and high-grade alluvial tin ore concentrates from Malaya, Siam, Indonesia, and other sources in the Far East and from Africa will be cut off completely. When that happens, the tin requirements of the United States and possibly those of our allies, aside from the supply on hand, must be obtained entirely from Bolivian tin ore concentrates and any other Western Hemisphere sources that can be found and developed. Bolivian tin ore concentrates, unlike high-grade alluvial concentrates, have a lower tin content, con-

tain many objectionable impurities, and are difficult to smelt. In fact, only one plant in the world, a small one recently completed by American private enterprise at Sewaren, N. J., is known to have facilities capable of successfully producing grade-A tin from low-grade Bolivian concentrates exclusively, without the admixture of high-grade alluvial concentrates.

The total tin requirements of the United States could be obtained from Bolivia if the great losses of tin incurred at the mines were eliminated by concentrating the ores to a much lesser degree than is now practiced and required by the trade and if processing facilities were available in the United States to convert such low-grade concentrates to grade-A tin metal.

A substantial part of the tin requirements of the United States could be obtained from Bolivian tin ore concentrates exclusively if facilities were available in the United States to produce grade-A tin metal from the grades and quantities of tin concentrates now available from Bolivia. Although the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., was constructed in 1941 for this very purpose it has proved to be unsuccessful. Few realize that the Texas City tin smelter cannot produce significant quantities of grade-A tin metal from average grade Bolivian tin concentrates without the admixture of high-grade alluvial tin concentrates from the Far East or Africa.

The Billiton Co.—N. V. Billiton Maatschappij—a Dutch corporation, through its wholly owned subsidiary, the Tin Processing Corp., was selected in 1941 to design, construct, operate, and manage our Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., in preference to competent American private enterprise because it claimed to have a tried and proven process for obtaining grade A tin metal from Bolivian tin concentrates exclusively without the admixture of high-grade alluvial tin concentrates obtainable only from outside the Western Hemisphere.

The record stands in glaring testimony that the Dutch Billiton Co. had no successful process for obtaining grade A tin from Bolivian concentrates exclusively and that our Government-owned tin smelter has not and cannot now function for the purpose for which it was originally conceived and planned.

The original lease and smelting agreements entered into on April 8, 1941, between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Tin Processing Corporation, the wholly owned subsidiary of the Dutch Billiton Co., provided for the design, construction, operation, and management of a plant with a capacity for the smelting and refining of Bolivian tin ores sufficient to yield not less than 18,000 long tons of tin per year and to be readily capable of expansion into a plant with a capacity sufficient to yield not less than 48,000 tons of fine tin per year. Subsequent amendments to the lease agreement provided for a plant with a capacity to smelt and refine, first, Bolivian tin ores sufficient to yield not less than 51,600 tons of fine tin per year; and

second, alluvial tin ores sufficient to yield approximately 43,200 tons of fine tin per year, or a total capacity to yield 94,800 long tons of fine tin per year.

Under the original tin-smelting agreement, the RFC agreed that the average tin content of the Bolivian ore to be delivered to the plant would be not less than 35 percent. In turn, the Tin Processing Corp. agreed and guaranteed to smelt such Bolivian ores without the use of high-grade alluvial ores, so that not less than 75 percent of the tin delivered would be in the form of grade A tin metal; that the balance of the tin delivered not exceeding 25 percent, would contain not less than 98 percent pure tin; but that in the event RFC required more than 75 percent of the tin delivered to meet grade A specifications, then all the tin delivered or such part as the RFC required would meet such grade A specifications of the Treasury Department. The Tin Processing Corp. further agreed that in the event the RFC acquired tin ores other than from Bolivia, such as high-grade alluvial ores, the guaranties would be adjusted so as to take account of the quantity and quality of such other ores.

Contrary to its claims, agreements, and guaranties, the Dutch Billiton Co. and its subsidiary, the Tin Processing Corp., designed and constructed a tin smelter for the United States Government which is not adapted to the successful treatment of Bolivian ores exclusively. The production and metallurgical records of the Texas City tin smelter furnish conclusive evidence of this fact.

The records show that the Texas City tin smelter has never produced grade A tin from Bolivian ores exclusively. It has always been necessary for the smelter to use substantial amounts of high grade alluvial tin concentrates from the Far East and Africa to smelt Bolivian ores. Even then, the results are relatively poor and fall far short of the guaranties given for Bolivian ores alone.

Until the past year or a little longer, when the amount of tin in high grade alluvial tin ores received at the smelter has equaled or exceeded the amount of tin in Bolivian ores received, a substantial proportion of the tin in Bolivian concentrates, instead of being converted to grade A tin metal, constantly flowed out of the plant in rejects and slimes resulting from the processing of Bolivian concentrates before smelting. The tin-bearing slimes and rejects have accumulated in outdoor ponds and are included in the tin inventories of the RFC. The actual tin content of the slimes is not known. Although 6,000 tons of rejects have been shipped to England for treatment, there is some doubt as to whether the tin in the slimes and the remainder of the rejects can be salvaged and, if so, at what cost. Tin-bearing slimes continue to be produced and accumulated at Texas City.

The annual report and financial statements of the RFC and subsidiary also shows that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, when 47½ percent or almost half of the tin in concentrates treated at the Government's Texas City smelter was in the form of easily smelted, high grade

alluvial type ores, only 65 percent of the tin metal produced was grade A, 27 percent was graded B, C, and D, and 8 percent was grade G metal. This poor record is far from the 75 to 100 percent production of grade A metal guaranteed by the Dutch Billiton Co. and the Tin Processing Corp. to be produced from Bolivian ores exclusively.

But the record is even worse than this. Only 30 percent of the tin in the Bolivian-type concentrates was recovered as grade A metal. Not 75 to 100 percent as guaranteed, but only 30 percent. In this instance, the Bolivian-type concentrates had an average tin content of 36.31 percent and the alluvial-type concentrates averaged 71.91 percent tin. It is obvious that if only 30 percent of the tin in Bolivian concentrates can be recovered as grade A metal when half of the tin in the mixture treated is in the form of high grade alluvial concentrates used for blending and upgrading, very little if any grade A metal could be successfully produced should it be necessary to use Bolivian concentrates exclusively.

It is not in the interests of the Dutch Billiton Co. and its subsidiary, the Tin Processing Corp., to develop and install a successful process for producing grade A metal from low- or average-grade Bolivian tin ore concentrates as long as the smelter is owned by the United States and a remote possibility exists that the smelter may some day be owned or operated by another company.

The Dutch Billiton Co., directly and through subsidiaries, is engaged in the smelting of tin in Holland, and is a partner with the Indonesian Government in the ownership of the tin mines of Indonesia, which is a major world source of high-grade alluvial tin ores and the source of most such ores obtained by RFC for the Texas City tin smelter. It also has other mining interests. For many years the Dutch Billiton Co. and British interests, directly and through subsidiaries, affiliates, interlocking directorships, and agreements, have held a monopoly on the tin production of the world. Because the Billiton Co. is built around the mining of tin ores in Indonesia, the smelting of tin in Holland, and the sale of tin in the world markets, and since the United States consumes about one-half of the world production of tin, it is obvious that a tin smelter located in the United States which could successfully and economically produce the bulk of our requirements for grade A tin from Bolivian ores exclusively, without the admixture of high-grade concentrates from Indonesia and other sources in the Eastern Hemisphere, would drastically reduce the business activities of the Dutch Billiton Co. unless such a smelter were owned by that company. It appears to be a foregone conclusion that as long as the Dutch Billiton Co., through its wholly-owned subsidiary, the Tin Processing Corp., continues to operate and manage the Government's Texas City tin smelter, that facility will never be able to function for the purpose for which it was originally planned and constructed by the Government of the United States. Only under the management of bona fide American private en-

terprise or of the Department of the Interior is there a chance of adapting the Texas City tin smelter to the function demanded for our national security.

Among the provisions of the contract between the RFC and the Tin Processing Corp. are (1) stipulations which give the Tin Processing Corp. what amounts to an option on the lease or sale of the Texas City smelter should the Government decide upon such disposition, and (2) a stipulation that any patents, formulas, processes, plants, and methods for smelting tin or recovering byproducts thereof, developed as a result of research carried on at the smelter by the Tin Processing Corp. at Government expense shall accrue solely to the Dutch company's subsidiary and to the RFC, but that the latter shall not willingly disclose any such information to third parties other than to actual operators of the smelter. The RFC cannot reveal such information to any prospective operators of the plan—those who may be interested in leasing or purchasing the Texas City tin smelter in the future. The Tin Processing Corp. does not admit visitors to the plant who are known to be sufficiently technically trained to find out details of the operation. The RFC retains all cost details and terms of contracts on a confidential basis.

In short, several million dollars of the American taxpayers' money have been spent on research and experimentation at the Government's tin smelter to the enlightenment and benefit of Dutch and possibly British commercial interests while American industry is denied and left in ignorance of such information and technical data. The interest of the United States demands that this state of affairs be terminated and the situation reversed. This can be accomplished only through a change in the management of the Government's tin smelter.

We owe the Dutch Billiton Co. and its Tin Processing Corp. nothing whatsoever. They failed to deliver a tin smelter capable of doing the job which our Government contracted for. Their agreements and guaranties have been worthless. They have received the full benefit of millions of dollars' worth of research and experimentation paid for by the United States, and while they have leased the plant for a nominal fee of \$1 per year, all operating and management costs have been paid by our Government and, in addition, they have received to date \$1,600,000 in fixed fees. American engineers, and not the Dutch management, are reported to have been the actual operators of the plant from the beginning; they can continue doing so under American management.

The Dutch Billiton Co., by making false claims and hollow agreements through which it obtained the contract for the design, construction, operation, and management of the Government's Texas City tin smelter, and the nominal control of tin smelting in the United States, gained the advantage over American private enterprise who wished to do the job and not only perpetrated what amounts to an outright fraud against the people of the United States but also seriously endangered the security of our

Nation. The several minor Government officials who know the facts and continue to protect and further the interests of the Dutch Billiton Co. and its Tin Processing Corp. must share the guilt.

The lease and smelting agreements between the RFC and the Billiton Co.'s Tin Processing Corp. now expire June 30, 1951. However, the agreements are subject to termination by the RFC at any time on 90 days' written notice without payment of any penalty or other sums for such action. H. R. 8569 and S. 3666, which has passed the Senate, should be amended to provide that the contracts with the Tin Processing Corp. be terminated on or before December 31, 1950, and that the operation and management of the Texas City tin smelter be placed in the hands of bona fide American private enterprise having no connections with the present management or, failing this, under the Department of the Interior. The bills should be further amended to provide that all research work and experimentation conducted at the smelter after December 31, 1950, shall be performed by or under the direction of the United States Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior and that the detailed results of all such research and experimentation shall be made available to American private enterprise.

The present authority for the operation of the Texas City smelter does not expire for another year. Both H. R. 8569 and S. 3666 extend the authority to 6 years hence. No true evidence whatsoever has been advanced or found in the facts on the tin situation which justifies the continued operation of the smelter. Authority to operate the Texas City tin smelter should not extend beyond June 30, 1952, at the most, which would coincide with the termination date of the "Defense Production Act of 1950" as proposed in H. R. 9176. H. R. 8569 and S. 3666 should be further amended to provide that, with respect to tin concentrates produced after December 31, 1950, the RFC shall purchase for use at the Texas City tin smelter only such concentrates in kind and quantity as will successfully yield not less than 90 percent of their tin content as grade A metal by the process used at the Government's smelter, research requirements excepted. This amendment would not preclude the purchase and stockpiling of low-grade Bolivian concentrates by the Munitions Board if it should decide to do so, but would permit such ores to be sold in the world markets at their commercial value instead of the higher subsidized prices paid for such material by the RFC. This in turn should enable American private enterprise to continue in operation and expand facilities which can produce approximately 100 percent grade A tin from the recoverable tin in low-grade Bolivian concentrates—thus adding immeasurably to the security of the United States insofar as its tin requirements are concerned.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DEWART. As a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining together with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think he has performed a real service in bringing out the situation that faces this country in renewing this authority; certainly the bill should be amended, and I believe the gentleman intends to offer an amendment to protect the interests of the United States in this tin smelter in that we shall have use of the patents, the methods, and the knowledge that is developed by our money in this Texas City plant. The gentleman is to be commended for bringing out the situation down there in Texas as regards tin because of this contract with this Dutch company.

Mr. SAILOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania appeared before the Rules Committee—I think my recollection is correct—he said that the Vulcan Detinning Corp., which is located in New Jersey, had a capacity of 500 tons a day. We investigated that. It is the only other tinning operation in the United States and it has a capacity of 5 tons a day.

Why were the Dutch placed in control of these operating contracts of the Texas City smelter? Because we needed the ore. The Dutch owned the ore and it was the only means by which we could obtain it. The Dutch East Indies was one of the great sources for the production of ore that was essential to furnish the needs of this great corporation.

Now to split hairs over this at a time when our national security is involved, at a time when we need tin more than we have ever needed it in a generation, it seems to me is not supporting the best interests of our country. If this corporation is closed, the production of 36,000 tons of tin so necessary to our war effort will cease. We never have needed this operation more than we need it at the present time. It has been a successful operation. They have smelted low-grade ore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said they blend the ores. As I understand it, they do not blend the ores at all. They smelt the high-grade ores and the low-grade ores, then they might combine them after they have been smelted.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. At the time this project was first propounded here in the Congress, I understood the emphasis was going to be placed on the processing of Bolivian ores. From the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I am led to ask at this time just how extensive comparatively have the operations there covered Bolivian ores as compared with Indonesian ores?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not have the percentages, but I know they have smelted the low-grade Bolivian ores.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Are they in position to take over exclusively the processing of Bolivian ores, supposing that the ocean lanes to Indonesian ores may be cut off?

Mr. SPENCE. I have been informed that that is the primary purpose, that they can take over the Bolivian ores and that they can smelt the Bolivian ores.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. In any quantity to replace the production of Indonesian ores?

Mr. SPENCE. They would probably need some of the higher-grade ores. But what would be the effect if you cut the whole operation off now? It would jeopardize our supply. It would certainly weaken the security of our country.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is not the point of my inquiry. My point is this: Can they swing to the processing of Bolivian ores? I notice there is a committee amendment on this bill indicating there was some evidence or testimony along that line or the amendment would not have been put in the bill that would lay special emphasis on Western Hemisphere tin ores.

Mr. SPENCE. I have not sufficient information upon that subject.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is an extremely important point because I am looking at the self-sufficiency of our Nation so far as critical materials are concerned. It is a lot different processing Bolivian ore and processing Indonesian ore.

Mr. SPENCE. They can process Bolivian ores and they have processed Bolivian ores. The primary purpose of their organization was to process Western Hemisphere ores.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMPSON. The answer to the question, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, is that the smelter can operate solely on Bolivian ores, if necessary. Naturally, if it is possible to secure the high-grade ores from Indonesia and the Far East, they will do that, and use the two of them together.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Will that involve any delay in their operations, such as tooling or anything else?

Mr. THOMPSON. No. They are tooled up for it, and they are processing both ores now.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And they can take over Bolivian ore exclusively in the processing at full capacity?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, during both World Wars I and II, the Nation found itself unable to secure an adequate supply of tin from abroad. In each case, it was necessary to build tin smelters to process, in this country, the ore from the Far East and more recently from Bolivia.

World War I smelters were decommissioned shortly after the end of the war and in the Second World War, it was necessary to build an entirely new plant.

Tin is used, among other things, for packaging food—a most essential requirement for supplying an army in the field. Also, it is used in making bronze which is required in machinery and very heavily in shipbuilding. Tin is also used for bearing metal. Every tank, jeep, submarine engine, in fact every machine which moves or turns, uses tin in its bearings and other vital parts. It is also used in making solder. Without an adequate supply of tin in time of war, the defense effort would be seriously crippled.

Since the end of World War II, the Government's only tin smelter—the Long Horn Tin Smelter at Texas City, Tex., has been operating to a large extent on the building up of the requisite stockpile for defense purposes. When this has been accomplished, the plant should be disposed of to private enterprise, and I have worked consistently toward this end for the past 2 years.

In order for it to be profitable for private operation, it appears that a tariff, or some other form of subsidy, will be required. This has proven to be a complicated and difficult matter and legislation providing for disposal of the smelter remains under consideration in committee.

In recent weeks, the National Security Resources Board concluded that, in the interests of national defense, the Texas City smelter should continue its operations. The legislation under which it functions will expire within a year and the Board recommended to the President that the necessary legislation be passed to provide for the operation for 5 years after the termination of the present law.

Accordingly, the President directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to cooperate with the National Security Resources Board in securing the adoption of the necessary legislation.

The bill before you, H. R. 8569, by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], and the companion measure, H. R. 8570, by myself are strictly administration measures and are recommended to the Congress in the interests of national defense with the full approval of the President. The legislation provides for a 5-year extension of the present operation. It should be most thoroughly understood that passage of the present legislation will not, in any degree, put an end to my efforts to dispose of the smelter to private industry. However, with the critical international situation now confronting us, the needs of national defense must have priority over all others.

It is hardly conceivable that anyone will oppose the legislation now under consideration. I say "hardly" conceivable because strangely enough one organization in the United States, acting through its lobbyist here in Washington, has done everything in its power to keep this administration measure from being passed by the committees at either end of the Capitol. The lobbyist voiced vehement opposition to the measure although he claimed that if it were in the interests of national defense he would not oppose it.

In spite of the unanimous opinion of the armed services, the National Security Resources Board, the Reconstruction Fi-

nance Corporation, the White House and others, this lobbyist continued to oppose the measure despite his protestations. He opposes it today. In the House committee, he proposed an amendment which sounded so innocent that it was accepted without any particular consideration and it appears now as a committee amendment to H. R. 8569. On its face, this amendment seems to be merely a statement of "due regard to the public interest." Actually, this amendment was recommended by the one organization opposing the bill, a corporation engaged in recovering tin from tin scrap which is attempting to develop a process for recovering pure tin from the very lowgrade Bolivian ores. At the moment, this corporation has virtually no production and at the most, if its process is proven, has a plant which would produce 5 tons of tin a day or approximately 2,000 tons of tin a year. There are approximately 18,000 tons of Bolivian tin available which are now being smelted at the Texas City smelter and our national needs exceed 60,000 tons a year in peacetime. The purpose behind the amendment is to attempt to tie the hands of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the administration of the law by preparing an argument that the "due regard to the public interest in the maintenance of domestic smelting of Western Hemisphere tin ores and concentrates by American private industry," states it to be the policy of the Congress to require the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to divert ores to other smelters in preference to the Texas City smelter. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not need instructions to act "with due regard to the public interest" and it should not be hampered in carrying out its obligations to Congress by inclusion in this legislation of this amendment.

The companion measure which passed in the other body does not have this amendment in it. It was considered in detail and was eliminated as being at least superfluous and possibly very dangerous. Personally, I shall never trust an amendment however innocent it may sound when it is proposed by a man whose avowed intention it is to kill the legislation under consideration.

I had contemplated introducing an amendment to strike out the language proposed by the lobbyist who wants to destroy the bill. I have not done so out of deference to the chairman of the committee, who will have an opportunity to consider the matter further in conference. Also, I have no desire to impede the early passage of the measure today.

In view of the present world conditions, it is imperative that the legislation be passed as quickly as possible. However, during the 5-year period, proposed in the new legislation, every effort should be made to make final disposition of the plant to private industry. I urge the immediate passage of the bill, and I hope that the conferees will eliminate the crippling amendment suggested by the one man who has appeared in opposition to the measure.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry," approved June 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 190), as amended, is amended by striking out "1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "1956."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after "1956", insert ", and by substituting for the period after the word 'designate' a colon, and adding the following: *Provided,* That such powers, functions, duties, and authority shall be exercised and performed with due regard to the public interest in the maintenance of domestic smelting of Western Hemisphere tin ores and concentrates by American private enterprise."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 1, line 8, after word "thereof", strike out "1956" and insert "1952."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to ask the Texas City Tin Smelter Corp. to actually prove to this Congress or to the duly authorized representatives, that sometime before the expiration of one additional year they can produce tin from low-grade Bolivian ores exclusively, and produce it in accordance with the contract they have entered into.

According to the information which the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Public Lands has received, this corporation has never to this day produced one pound of tin from low grade Bolivian ores exclusively. I know that tin is an essential and a vital war material. Nobody wants to hamper this country in its all-out war effort at this time, but certainly if we are going to be shut off from the supplies of the Far East, and the only sources of tin we have are the low-grade concentrates of Bolivia, then we should know now if this corporation, which entered into a contract in 1941 for the production of high-grade tin from low-grade Bolivian ore, can produce it. Certainly, if we extend this one more year to June 30, 1952, that will be ample time for them to do it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there could not be a more effective way to kill this bill than to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is absolutely essential that the operation of the Texas City tin smelter continue for 5 years in order that the contracts may be negotiated and in order that they may have available an adequate supply of the ore.

Another reason why it should be continued is that you could not keep the personnel of this organization, who are skilled personnel, for 24 hours if they could get some employment elsewhere. It would absolutely destroy the usefulness of the Texas City tin smelter, which has an excellent record. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 2, line 4, after the last word substitute a colon for the period and add the following: *Provided further,* That on or before December 31, 1950, the present lease and smelting agreements, as amended, shall be terminated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the operation and management of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., shall be awarded to bona fide American private enterprise which has no affiliations or interests whatsoever in tin mining or smelting outside of the Western Hemisphere, or, if this cannot be accomplished satisfactorily, such operation and management shall be given to and undertaken by the United States Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior: *And provided further,* That all research and experimentation performed with United States Government funds at, or for the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., after December 31, 1950, shall be conducted by or under the supervision of the United States Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, and the detailed results of all such research and experimentation shall be made available to American private enterprise unless and except to the extent that such results would reveal details of processes owned and contributed by any operator of the tin smelter and not known to the minerals and metals industry or described in literature available to the public."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, as I said in my original remarks, the present contract does not permit the experiments that are being conducted at that plant on our money to become our property. They will actually belong to the Dutch Government. This amendment would provide that, after December 31, 1950, any experimenting that is done at our expense will become the property of the United States Government or our people. I certainly think that that, being a part of the contract, is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chairman has examined the basic law sought to be extended by the bill now before the committee. The language in the basic law states clearly, among other things, "to finance research in tin smelting and processing, and (4) to do all other things necessary to the accomplishment of the foregoing shall continue in effect until June 30, 1951, or until such earlier time as the Congress shall otherwise provide."

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] offers an alternative proposition, to place it in other departments of the Government.

Therefore the Chair holds that the amendment is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, on a number of occasions since I have been a Member of the Congress I have heard

about the extension programs for research sponsored by our Government. One of the best arguments that has been advanced in support of this research program is that its results are made available to all American industries. Historically, it is a matter of common knowledge that the Dutch and English control the tin market. They control all the known sources of high-grade tin ores in the world today. If there are going to be American tax dollars spent for research in this project, and apparently there is going to be, in accordance with the original agreements, all of the research information belongs solely to the Dutch. The purpose of this amendment is to make the results of whatever research is done at the expense of the American taxpayers available to American industry. I am not in favor of spending our money for research in this country developing matters which are to the advantage of the Dutch and the British without letting our own American taxpayers who are footing the bill have the benefit of it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think it is necessary to say anything about this. The gentleman's amendment would require an agency of the United States to break a contract it has made for the operation of the Texas smelter. The Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall make any law impairing the obligation of a contract. It seems to me the same high ideals of honor should prevail as to the United States as is enjoined upon the States. Of course, the adoption of this amendment would simply mean the scuttling of this great enterprise.

Mr. DEWART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DEWART. How about when we broke the gold standard? Was that not an agreement?

Mr. SPENCE. Oh, that is too far back and does not involve the same question. I ask the amendment be voted down.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman spoke about breaking a contract. I understand that that contract expires in 1951. This bill has as its purpose extending that law.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes. This amendment says that we shall terminate it 6 months before it is terminated by the terms of the contract. Expenditures have been made down there and they have acted on the good faith of the United States. I do not think the United States or any agency has a right to terminate a contract such as this before its expiration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think this committee should understand what we are doing here. We are proposing in time of war to extend a contract with a Dutch company under conditions that do not guarantee us any tin from this smelter, or the results of any of the experiments or processes or knowledge that are developed by this smelter.

Let me read to you some of the provisions of the contract which the RFC has entered into in connection with this tin smelter:

1. Stipulations which afford the Tin Processing Corp. what amounts to an option on the lease or sale of the smelter, should the Government decide upon such disposition.

That lease or sale is to a Dutch company.

2. A stipulation that any patents, formulas, processes, plans, and methods for smelting tin or recovering the byproducts thereof, developed as a result of a research carried on at the smelter by the Tin Processing Corp. (at Government expense) shall accrue solely to the Dutch company's subsidiary and to the RFC, but the latter shall not willingly disclose any such information to third parties other than to actual operators of the smelter.

In other words, the RFC cannot disclose these patents or processes to an American. They must go to the Dutch company.

The only purpose of extending this bill is because of the war effort, the need for tin for our stockpile, and for the war effort, and here we propose under this contract entered into under the original law of which this will be an extension to give those rights to a foreign country and not to our own citizens. Certainly, this amendment should be adopted in the interest of our stockpile and in the interest of our national defense and the interest of the taxpayers of this country.

I hope the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] suggests that the adoption of this amendment would scuttle the bill. Let me read the amendment:

After the last word, substitute a colon for the period and add the following: "Provided further, That on or before December 31, 1950, the present lease and smelting agreements, as amended, shall be terminated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the operation and management of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, shall be awarded to bona fide American private enterprise which has no affiliations or interest whatsoever in tin mining or smelting outside of the Western Hemisphere, or, if this cannot be accomplished satisfactorily, such operation and management shall be given to and undertaken by the United States Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior: And provided further, That all research and experimentation performed with United States Government funds at, or for, the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., after December 31, 1950, shall be conducted by or under the supervision of the United States Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, and the detailed results of all such research and experimentation shall be made available to American private enterprise unless and except to the extent that such results would reveal details of processes owned and contributed by any operator of the tin smelter and not known to the minerals and metals industry or described in literature available to the public.

That amendment does not scuttle the bill; it says that if you cannot get an American operator who is ready to take it over by December 31, 1950, you will turn it over to the Bureau of Mines and let the Bureau of Mines operate it.

Certainly, the history of tin in America is not one which does us much credit. I happen to represent a district which has at various times thought it had a good deal of tin ore. We have many towns out there which carry the name "Tin"; we have the town of Tinton and Tin Mountain and Tin Reef. We have the old Harney-Peak Tin Co. which figures in the deeds to a great deal of property in the Black Hills area. The Hill City Tin Miner was the name of a paper published for some years in that area. Shortly after the Harney-Peak Tin Co. got under way back in the nineties and it threatened to become a factor in the production of tin in the United States or in the world, British interests came in and bought up the stock and closed it down.

While I cannot here suggest that we have tin enough to supply the needs of the country, yet we do have tin enough that representatives of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey and other Government agencies have indicated they might be of great value to the country in a critical period.

The whole tendency of our legislation in this country has been to cater to British and Dutch tin interests, with the result that we have stifled the development of the tin industry in this country and handicapped the exploration of such deposits as we do have in the States and in Alaska.

When I was returning from Europe with the Herter committee in the fall of 1947, I remember reading in the London Economist an article to the effect that we should shut down the tin smelters in this country to show our good faith in our efforts toward the rehabilitation of Europe. The Economist advocated that as a reciprocal act on the part of the United States that would show that we were really trying to rehabilitate Europe. Imagine that. And so I say we depend upon them too much.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to my friend from South Dakota that there is much in what he said, and there is much in what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said; in truth and in fact, there is too much truth in what has been said on the other side of the aisle. But let me talk about this for just a minute from a practical standpoint.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman want to use the remainder of my time?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I will get the gentleman more time if I may proceed for just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. We know that there is a monopoly, a world-wide monopoly in tin ore. When this original contract was written, it was written by Jesse Jones, Chairman of the RFC, and I do not think there is a harder or straighter one in America today. Let us go ahead with this thing as it is, because tin is one of the most important war materials that the Army and the Navy require.

The gentleman from South Dakota knows that I have tried to go along with him, and we are going along with him in developing some strategic materials out in the mountainous country of the West, and that ought to be done. We will earmark some money in the independent offices appropriation bill, and when we go to conference with the Senate we are going to try to work that thing out and develop those resources in his State and the other States where they have tin, manganese, and these very critical materials. Let us not upset the apple cart in the case of this tin smelter. We need it badly. We are flirting with dynamite. Let us not slow down the processes. Of course, we do not like the situation we are in, but the simple truth of the matter is that we must have that ore, and the only place we can get it in large quantity is from the British and the Dutch. I hope the amendment is voted down; however, I will cooperate with the gentleman on the matters he is interested in.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I say in conclusion that the reason we find ourselves in one crisis after another is because we do not stand up on our hind legs as Americans and develop the United States. As long as we continue contracts and practices like this, where we rely upon the favor of other people, we are going to have more and more of these crises. The American people are getting sick and tired of this continual recurrence of crises, getting into one trouble, then getting out of that by pointing to something a little bigger and more dangerous. The American people are going to express themselves on this subject one of these days and in no uncertain terms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the smelter in question is located in my district and, naturally, I am very vitally interested in it and quite familiar with it. There are a good many misconceptions that have been voiced here this afternoon. One fact I would like very much to impress particularly on the committee is that every agency of the Government which has any responsibility whatever for national defense, the stockpile, security in general, has asked for the passage of the bill as is. They know all of the objections which have been raised by the opposition. These have been weighed carefully and considered and put aside in the interest of the Nation.

Let me say just a word about the operators. The contract was made with them during the war for the reason that

they had the know-how to treat the low-grade Bolivian ore which then seemed to be our only source of ore. They had the know-how. Also if anybody could ever get any ore out of the Far East only they would be able to do it. Now, like any business firm, they wrote into the contract, passed by Jesse Jones, that they would have certain options. Any business firm would have done exactly the same thing. They have provided an excellent operation. They have brought out the tin that was needed, and which was essential during the war, and still is for the stockpile.

May I clear up one other little misconception. This is not a war hysteria measure. This has been thought of and talked about; it has been in process in one way or another for 2 years that I know of, because I have a bill pending which would turn that plant over to private enterprise. If I return here next year I expect to renew the effort to place that plant in private hands to operate; then it will be up to the Government agency responsible to pick a proper purchaser or lessee, as the case may be.

But in the meantime this amendment would ask the operators, who have done a good successful job, to turn over their trade secrets to a rival concern. I think that is what is at the bottom of all this objection. It comes up every time a smelter bill is being considered in the committee or in the House. It stems, I believe, from a rival concern that would like very much to have those secrets. They would like to go into a competitive operation.

I hope that the opposition, in the interests of national defense, will withhold its opposition this afternoon and let us provide for the continued operation of that plant for the next 5 years. I will work with them for the permanent disposition of it whenever they are ready. In the meantime, let us not hamper the smelter and, above all, do not set a limit of 1 year, and do not require them to terminate the agreement by the end of this year, because if you do the operators cannot make a contract that would be worth anything. They cannot proceed as any business firm ought to proceed on a reasonably long-range basis.

I hope this amendment will be defeated and that you will give us an opportunity to provide for the national defense in this matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Can the gentleman tell me what benefit the Government of the United States will derive from this contract?

Mr. THOMPSON. They will continue the production of tin, and we will be certain to have tin for war purposes out of the stockpile.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Well, do we get any as the result of this contract?

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly we do. We have a tremendous stockpile of it. It has been successful. They smelt 36,000 tons a year. The stockpiling figures are confidential, as the gentleman

knows, but the national defense people think it is extremely successful.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWARD: Page 2, line 4, strike out the period and add: "including the right to the knowledge and use of any patents, formulas, process, plans and methods for smelting tin or recovering the byproducts thereof."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane. It is practically the same amendment that has just been voted on; in practically the same words, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Kentucky has made the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWARD], that it is not germane and that it is identical with the amendment just voted on by the committee. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is not an identical amendment, although it contains a portion of an amendment previously voted on by the committee; therefore the Chair holds that the amendment is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not identical with the other amendment in that it does not disturb the present contract and does not limit the time. It simply provides that this process, these patents, this knowledge, this understanding of the handling of tin that is gained through the use of our money, through a plant that our money built, will be available to American processors. It does not interfere with the present contract. The operation of the plant can go on as heretofore, but it does make this knowledge and these patents available to our American industry. I think it is important that this amendment be adopted so that we can distribute to other tin plants in this country the knowledge that the taxpayers' money in this country has provided and will develop in the future.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I am not as familiar with this legislation as I should be, but I am wondering if this observation is not correct, that American taxpayers are more or less financing or supporting a foreign cartel with respect to this tin business.

Mr. D'EWARD. There is no question but that there is a cartel mixed up with this whole tin industry and the cartel, in effect, distributes the ores that are developed in Bolivia and other countries and also has a lot to do with what becomes of the metals that are processed from these ores.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I earnestly urge that this amendment be agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the purpose of this amendment is exactly the same as that of the one we just voted down. It is certainly not intended to help the operation of the tin smelter. Let me invite your attention to this: So far as a cartel is concerned, through this plant you have the only protection you could possibly have against a cartel. In that plant there are two and sometimes three members of the Dutch firm that operates it. All the rest are American workmen, most of them recruited locally, and every one taught the know-how necessary to operate a tin smelter. Presumably that force would stay right there in the event of any change of hands, in the event the Billiton people went out of business.

There seems to be no reason on earth why the applecart, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] just said, should be upset at this stage of the game. If you do want to tamper with the long-range operation, then let us do it under the permanent legislation that will follow and is designed to really give us private operation of the plant.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. I was very much interested in the gentleman's explanation of why it was not a cartel. Will not the profits and the benefits inure to the benefit of the owners rather than to the laborers, just as if the laborers were working in some other factory? I cannot see the gentleman's logic in saying this is not a cartel for the simple reason that though the ownership is in the Dutch the operations are performed by American laborers.

Mr. THOMPSON. The ownership is not in the Dutch at all, the ownership is in the American Government, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Dutch operate it simply because they had the best offer at the time the first lease was made.

Mr. POULSON. That is the ownership of the plant, but the benefits as far as the know-how is concerned are still in the ownership of the Dutch?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is correct, but do not forget that all of those secrets are now in the hands of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and at the disposal of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to be turned over to anybody they think is proper.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, 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. 8569) to strengthen the common defense by extending for 5 years the authority for the Texas City tin-smelter operation, pursuant to House Resolution 714, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3666) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry", approved June 28, 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 8569 as passed, as follows:

"That section 2 of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry', approved June 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 190), as amended, is amended by striking out '1951' and inserting in lieu thereof '1956', and by substituting for the period after the word 'designate' a colon, and adding the following: 'Provided, That such powers, functions, duties, and authority shall be exercised and performed with due regard to the public interest in the maintenance of domestic smelting of Western Hemisphere tin ores and concentrates by American private enterprise.'"

The 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.

The proceedings by which the bill H. R. 8569 was passed were vacated and the bill was laid on the table.

GET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, Thursday, July 20, from the well of the House, the Representative from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], in a 1-minute speech, among other things, said:

Mr. Speaker, I am having a great many requests from women, saying they would like to join the Marines or WAVES or WACS. They are anxious to do all they can for their country in this time of emergency and stress. Some have even stated that they would like to have a draft of women if they have a draft of men.

Replying immediately thereafter, I tried to make the point that we were not yet so weak in manpower that it was necessary to draft women or compel them to fight with the armed services.

A further point which I sought to make was that, in drafting the young men, both a physical and a mental examination was required; that the result was that those among the young men who were the more physically and mentally fit were taken into the service while those who did not pass these tests remained at home; and that many of the drafted were killed, more were wounded, a still smaller percentage returned to this country mentally impaired.

My further argument was that the women of this country, whose loyalty, whose contribution to our wars has never been questioned, were entitled as a matter of right to select as a husband and the father of their children a typical young American—not a displaced person who, after a war, came to this country, or one from a group from which the most physically and mentally desirable had been removed by the draft. Anything wrong about that?

Ordinarily, I can make my meaning clear, leave little room for misunderstanding, but apparently on this occasion I was too subtle, for it is evident my words were misunderstood.

The Detroit Free Press, in an editorial of Saturday, July 22, referring to me, among other things, said:

He intimated that woman's interest in getting in some war activity was to catch a husband. If they want men that bad, HOFFMAN suggested, they can get displaced persons from Europe.

For some reason best known to its publisher or editorial writers, the Detroit Free Press has more than once either misconstrued or misrepresented what I have said, what I have condemned or advocated.

In replying to the suggestion that, if we are to have a draft of men, we should have a draft of women, I did not then

use, nor have I ever at any time used, words which carried the suggestion "that women's chief interest in getting into some war activity was to catch a husband."

Nor did I ever suggest that, if the women of America wanted a husband, "they can get displaced persons from Europe."

Several times I have argued, as I now contend, that, if the draft is to take two or three million young Americans and, in taking them, is to select those best physically and mentally qualified, that process deprives the young woman of America of the opportunity to get the kind of a man she might otherwise have; that, to a large extent, her choice would be limited to those who were disqualified for the draft, or to some displaced person or an immigrant.

My thought was, and it is, that such a result was most unfair to the young women of America.

The Detroit Free Press editorial further states:

No woman of whom we know really wants to go to war.

Nor do I. In my humble judgment, it would be a grievous mistake to draft the young women, put them into the armed services as we do the men.

What I tried to say was this: That, because of the war and the selective-service draft, the opportunity of the average young American woman to find a husband of her choice would be limited.

After my remarks were made on the floor, the Member from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] phoned me, said she had been hurt by my remarks and requested that I omit them from the printed RECORD.

Because I did not consider my statement of very great importance, and because I greatly admire Mrs. ROGERS and did not care to needlessly hurt her feelings, I complied with her request. Now, because of letters which I have received, protesting my remarks—the letters undoubtedly being based upon a misconception of what I said—and because of this editorial, which is circulated in my district, I now ask permission to include the remarks made on that occasion.

Those remarks were as follows:

WOMEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, no one questions the patriotism, the ability or the willingness of women to render service either in peacetime or when we are at war. Nor does anyone question the value of those services. But I do not agree with the suggestion that we should draft women.

Women can render the most valuable service when we are at war if, instead of serving in the front lines, they will just stay at home, doing their part on the home front in many ways—sometimes in industrial plants, sometimes as civilian or professional workers and assistants, or in taking care of their husbands and sons, or, by letters of encouragement, maintaining the morale of those they have sent to the front.

I do not believe that it is either necessary or desirable, as has been suggested, that we create an army of Amazons.

Nor do I believe that our women should be required, as the years or the centuries roll on, to provide continuous crops of cannon fodder for successive wars, as they will

be required to do if we are to police the world, fight in every war in which ambitious or power-mad politicians of other nations may from time to time involve us.

But there is something in the situation which calls for the drafting of our men which tends to cloud the future. That is the fact that the best young men of America—at least from a physical and mental standpoint—are to be drafted, sent abroad there to fight, some to die, others to be wounded, others to be returned home mentally impaired, their initiative broken while from those rejected, or from those who come to us from abroad, our women select their husbands.

Our young women can look forward, on the record thus far made, not to having a fine young American for a husband, for the father of their children, but being compelled, if she would marry, to select that husband from among those who were left behind or from the displaced persons or others who come to us from Europe or Asia, some of whom—all too often—feeling charged with a mission to remake our form of government.

PROVIDING FOR MODIFICATION OR CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN ROYALTY-FREE LICENSES

Mr. BRYSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2128) to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain royalty-free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder.

FEPC

Mr. DAVENPORT. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, Americans who understand the true nature of the world-wide struggle between democracy and totalitarianism were shocked when the struggle for an FEPC was abandoned. To the peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, this action is being interpreted to mean that we talk democracy but do not live it. We know this is not the case, that by comparison with other nations our democracy is of the highest order. Nevertheless, the FEPC would have improved our way of life. It would have added significantly to individual opportunity and would have blunted antiminority groups in this country. In addition, it would have knocked the props from under Soviet propagandists who are trying to mislead struggling peoples everywhere. If we are to hold the offensive in a world of ideals and community practice, we must not give the cynical and duping Communists the opportunity to throw up our shortcomings to the religious, economic, and racial minorities throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a letter to President Truman from the Allegheny County Council for Civil Rights:

JULY 25, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the 40 organizations in the Allegheny County Council for Civil Rights, we wish to call to your

attention proposals which are basic to the success of the United Nations action in Korea.

As persons of all races, creeds, and national origins, we believe it is urgent that the United States demonstrate to people everywhere that democracy works effectively.

Every American wants to share in the responsibilities as well as the privileges of democracy. To accomplish this we urge you to use your office to insure the most efficient utilization of the Nation's human resources. We urge you to consider the following proposals:

1. That you continue and accelerate the policy of nonsegregation in the armed forces;
2. That you issue an order comparable to the FEPC Executive order which eliminated discrimination in industrial employment during World War II;
3. That you encourage the earliest possible ratification of the Genocide Convention;
4. That you take steps to end the Oriental Exclusion Policy of our immigration laws.

These actions will demonstrate clearly to the peoples of the world the validity of our claim to the democratic way of life.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. L. B. MOSELEY,

Rev. R. PIERRE JOHNSON,

Cochairmen.

Member organizations: Allegheny County Committee on Fair Employment; Americans for Democratic Action; American Federation of Labor, Teamsters 609; American Jewish Committee; American Service Institute of Allegheny County; American Veterans Committee Auxiliary; Amvets, Allegheny County Council; Association of Community Councils; B'nai B'rith Women's Council of Greater Pittsburgh; Conference of Jewish Women's Organizations; Council of Churches (Race Relations Commission); First Unitarian Church Social Action Committee; Hill District People's Forum; Interracial Action Council; Irene Kaufmann Settlement; Jewish Community Relations Council of Pittsburgh; Jewish Labor Committee; Loendi Club; Mayor's Civic Unity Council; National Achievement Clubs, Inc.; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Pittsburgh Council of Catholic Women; Pittsburgh Metropolitan Council of Negro Women; Pittsburgh Roundtable, National Conference of Christians and Jews; Pittsburgh Section, National Council of Jewish Women; Sociology Club (Instructors); Soho Community House; Steel City Industrial Union Council, CIO; United Mine Workers of America; Urban League of Pittsburgh; Western Pennsylvania Council of B'nai B'rith; United Vocational and Employment Service; Youth Advisory Committee, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; Young Women's Christian Association of Pittsburgh.

TRAGEDY AT MYRTLE BEACH, S. C.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the city of Nashville is in mourning today.

On Sunday afternoon, as members of their families awaited their returning from maneuvers, word came that 30 valiant sons and soldiers had perished in the inferno of a National Guard plane crash near Myrtle Beach.

Words are weak in the face of sacrificial action that characterized the dying of these young men. They died in line of duty, and I have been informed

by the Air Forces that they were traveling under competent orders. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Government through the Veterans' Administration will assume the full responsibility it owes to the families of these young men. This, of course, can be but small comfort to the loved ones left behind, but it is the least a grateful Government can do for men who wear the uniform of the armed services.

These young men were preparing themselves for service in the defense of freedom and liberty at a time when forces of evil and aggression again challenge democratic ideals and institutions.

I knew personally some of them and I am sure that Members of the House join me in extending our very sincere sympathy to the families of all of them in their hour of grief.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN RAISING REVENUES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's paper, it is being suggested that the tax bill which passed this House just prior to the Korean conflict, and which is now in the Senate, be used as the vehicle for the enactment of the emergency taxes needed to meet our increased defense costs.

I certainly believe that we must take the necessary action to raise as far as possible the revenue to pay for the enlarged defense expenditures of this country, and I believe the Ways and Means Committee should begin work on this job immediately. I object strenuously, however, to any procedure which will violate the spirit of the Constitution and invade the prerogatives of the House of Representatives.

Article I, section 7 of the Constitution provides that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. It is shocking that consideration is being given to violating the spirit, if not the letter, of this provision of the Constitution.

If such a procedure is followed, it will mean that the Ways and Means Committee will be shut out completely from consideration of this most important matter. It will mean denial to the House itself of one of its basic prerogatives under the Constitution. This matter will come to the floor of the House, not as a bill entitled to full and complete debate, but it will come to us only as a conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity of the Constitution, of the House of Representatives, and of the Ways and Means Committee is involved in this decision.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THIS IS NOT THE TIME TO ASK OUR GOVERNMENT FOR MONEY EXCEPT WHERE ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY—WE MUST CUT EXPENDITURES TO THE BONE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when this Congress must reappraise and reexamine expenditures and authorizations charged to the Federal Government. It must be done in light of the impending crisis. We have got to cut our nondefense expenditures to the bone and cancel all unnecessary non-defense authorizations if we expect to protect our country and have sufficient funds to carry us through this imminent emergency.

Only a short time ago, and after weeks of debate, a liberal authorization bill costing the taxpayers of this country \$27,340,000,000 was approved by the House. It was my view then, and I am now more convinced than ever, that amount could have been reduced with respect to nonwar activities. Even so, it was considerably lower than the recommendation of the administration. Approximately \$11,000,000,000 is for nondefense agencies.

When the bill got to the other end of the Capitol, the committee in charge not only restored the cuts made by the House for departmental operation, but assured a continuance of business as usual in the operation of the already overmanned nonwar agencies. This was done, and is still being done, in the face of a world crisis.

I was surprised to learn that the Senate committee increased the House bill from \$27,340,000,000 to \$32,500,000,000, an increase of more than \$5,000,000,000, almost all for nonwar activities.

I am amazed that the body at the other end of the Capitol has thus far outdone itself in deference to "pork-barrel interests." The House, in my judgment, allocated more funds than necessary for public works projects. The House bill, as I have already suggested, was liberal in its expenditures. But the Senate has added \$132,400,000, nearly all of which goes to provide funds for new projects, including a good many of doubtful necessity.

The thing to which I want to call your attention is that nearly all of the increases at the other end of the Capitol have nothing to do with the war effort. \$132,500,000 is for nonwar public projects. It is purely "pork."

When the appropriation bill came before the House, I tried at that time to convince the membership that no new projects of any kind should be started unless it could be shown they were absolutely necessary. I find today that 79 new planning projects have been added by the other body that were not in the House bill. There are 23 projects for construction not in the House bill and not even in the President's budget, and

in 125 other cases the committee approved sums in excess of the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, in view of international commitments already made, and more to be made, all unnecessary projects should at least be deferred. Some of them might be worth while, but a good many harbors and inlets are more important for yachting and pleasure boating and boondoggling than for the interests of our country.

There are other items to be considered. The House cut operating expenses in the Department of Agriculture amounting to \$16,300,000. These expenses take nothing away from the farmer, but the committee at the other end of the Capitol decided to put it all back in the bill. On independent offices and other agencies they did a similar job.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the condition of our Treasury and the terrific debt that is hanging over us, and considering especially the millions and billions that will need to be expended for the protection of our people, we ought to cut every proposed nonwar expenditure to the very limit and save every dollar possible for the present crisis. The head of every agency of our Government ought to come forth with a report telling this Congress wherein funds for manpower can be saved, so we may have more to apply on the need for war expenditures that confront us. This is no time to be asking the Government for any money not absolutely needed.

Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that in 1948, only 2 years ago, the Federal Government spent \$6,400,000,000 on a domestic program. The 1951 budget now under consideration calls for \$12,000,000,000 for a similar program.

Mr. Speaker, we can, in my opinion, save not less than \$5,000,000,000 by reducing activities of nonwar agencies, including peacetime public projects and other items not absolutely needed at this critical time. We could also reduce the expenditure of funds that are being sent to Europe for civilian projects, including the building of power plants in Italy and in France. Yes, and strike out such items as one that provides for such increases as the rehabilitation of Monte Carlo.

Let no one ask for money from our Government unless it can be shown that it is absolutely necessary at this crucial hour. We have got to tighten our belts and work together to pull our country through the impending crisis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include newspaper clippings.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and at one point insert

two letters, and another point to include some extraneous material.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GILMER (at the request of Mr. STEED) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BIEMILLER AND Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost over \$300.

Mr. LYNCH and Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. CLEMENTE) were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a clipping from yesterday's paper.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1027. An act for the relief of the Merit Co.;

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades;

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Tevfik Kamili Kutay;

S. 2864. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; and

S. 3937. An act to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the armed forces of the United States.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3506. An act for the relief of Louis P. Murphy, United States Immigrant Inspector, El Paso, Tex.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1590. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the stock-piling program and a statistical supplement to that report, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8396. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORAND: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8726. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt from duty sound recordings for news broadcasts; with amendment (Rept. No. 2728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the disposition of Executive papers. House Report No. 2734. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the disposition of Executive papers. House Report No. 2735. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the disposition of Executive papers. House Report No. 2736. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6343. A bill relating to customs duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 2737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7447. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and newsreels; with amendment (Rept. No. 2738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 2739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9215. A bill to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6304. A bill to provide certain authorizations for the Department of State and the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, in carrying out the functions of the Commission and to facilitate compliance with the provisions of the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tia Juana Rivers and of the Rio Grande below Fort Quitman, Tex., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee of conference. S. 2128. An act to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain royalty-free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2742). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4256. A bill for the relief of James A. G. Martindale; with amendment (Rept. No. 2729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6760. A bill for the relief of Dr. In Sung Kwak; without amendment (Rept. No. 2730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9166. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Hendrickx; without amendment (Rept. No. 2731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5244. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles J. Trees, Army of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9087. A bill for the relief of H. Dale Madison; with amendment (Rept. No. 2733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 9227. A bill to require Federal district courts to enforce certain support orders of State courts, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 9228. A bill for the creation of the Foreign Affairs Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9229. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 9230. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9231. A bill to amend section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (Clayton Act), approved October 15, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 9232. A bill authorizing and directing the construction and repair of passenger, cargo, and tanker vessels necessary for the national defense; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 9233. A bill to provide that certain enlisted men of the Armed Forces shall not be assigned to duty in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 9234. A bill to promote the common defense by authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to undertake the survey and repair of certain reserve-status

merchant vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 735. Resolution to authorize the creation of a special committee to conduct studies and investigations relating to the procurement of materials and supplies pursuant to the national defense program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

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 Alabama, requesting the enactment of legislation ordering the deportation of all Communists in the United States who are deportable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, requesting that appropriate action be taken to recompense the State of Washington for wear and deterioration of its highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 9235. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catalina Apacible Limjap and her three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 9236. A bill for the relief of H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 9237. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9238. A bill for the relief of Maurice C. Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 9239. A bill for the relief of Mikiko Nishimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 9240. A bill for the relief of Atsuko Iemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 9241. A bill to grant increased retired pay to Maj. Gen. Wilson B. Burr, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 9242. A bill for the relief of Yoko Kominami and Betty Ann Kominami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. Res. 734. Resolution for the relief of Otho F. Hipkins, individually, and Otho F. Hipkins; Cecil Clyde Squier; Conrad Reid; J. Thomas C. Hopkins, Jr.; and Isaiah Lawrence Paxton, as trustees of the Hipkins Traction Device Co.; 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:

2288. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Bertha Miller and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2289. Also, petition of James Nels Ekberg, Represa, Calif., relative to a redress of grievance for just compensation for a term of unlawful and illegal Federal restraint and imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

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

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

Our Father God, from the tumult of an angry world we seek the sanctuary of Thy presence, not that we may escape the world, but that we may turn to the perplexing maze of its tragic problems with strengthened spirits and quiet minds. In a shaken world we seek stability. In an anguished world we need inner peace. In a fearful world grant us confidence and courage.

We confess that in the conceit of our self-sufficiency too often we have turned with our burning thirsts to the broken cisterns of worldly wisdom and of our own sophisticated cleverness. Help us this noontide to turn our faces to Thy shining, O Thou Sun of our help and strength. If in this hour of a supreme test, as the free world battles against slavery, the way to victory is long and difficult and won at last with crimson cost, still keep our wills steadfast and our faith strong as was the faith of our fathers when they built this Nation of our love and prayer. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 25, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN, who is absent by leave of the Senate until August 2, was further excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate until August 15.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPPEL was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate from today until August 3.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Tuesday of next week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Chapman	Eastland
Anderson	Chavez	Eaton
Benton	Connally	Ellender
Brewster	Cordon	Ferguson
Bricker	Darby	Flanders
Bridges	Donnell	Frear
Butler	Douglas	George
Byrd	Downey	Gillette
Capehart	Dworshak	Graham

Green	Langer	Robertson
Gurney	Lehman	Russell
Hayden	Lodge	Saltonstall
Hendrickson	McCarran	Schoeppel
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Hill	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Hoey	McFarland	Sparkman
Holland	McKellar	Stennis
Humphrey	McMahon	Taft
Hunt	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Ives	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Jenner	Martin	Thye
Johnson, Colo.	Maybank	Tydings
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Wherry
Kefauver	Murray	Wiley
Kem	Neely	Williams
Kerr	O'Connor	Young
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	
Knowland	Pepper	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is detained on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3666) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9178) to suspend restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1950.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a Mid-year Economic Report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the Economic Report of the President of January 6,